BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08653 370 8

№ 7578.543

GIVEN BY

Lucia Ames Mead

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.

DEC 27		

FORM NO. 609; 3,8.35; 350M.

WHAT YOUNG PEOPLE OUGHT TO KNOW ABOUT WAR AND PEACE

75-78.543.

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

Author of "Swords and Ploughshares"

BOSTON:
NEW ENGLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1916.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

9104

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

WHAT YOUNG PEOPLE OUGHT TO KNOW ABOUT WAR AND PEACE

—o—

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHERS

—o—

That the rising generation may wisely meet the problems sure to face civilization at the end of the war, it must be taught at school many things which the last generation never knew. This war will affect the incomes, taxation, charities, politics and outlook of generations to come. May 18, the anniversary of the first Hague Conference, should be utilized to give new information to be amplified incidentally through the year in the teaching of history, geography, literature, patriotism, civics and economics. The miscellany of music, poetry and isolated quotations which have frequently occupied the time on May 18 may well give way to solid instruction followed by questions or written themes. But vastly more will depend upon the teacher's moral earnestness and power to grasp the new situation than upon specific data that he imparts.

He must show that this war has not been due to blood lust of any people. It was the result of confused thinking, crooked logic, prejudice and economic illusions on the part of the powerful to whom the peoples blindly entrusted the power over life and death. But for the fearful speed of telegraphic ultimatums, the war might have been avoided. It will be the peculiar function of our cosmopolitan people to help bring together the embittered nations and to show the method of

obtaining permanent peace. We must begin at once to prepare for this stupendous task. The world's future as well as ours depends upon our success. Each pupil must be made to see his share in this great, new responsibility as a citizen of a country that is privileged to have tried that principle of federation which can alone save the nations from universal suspicion, conscription and eventually a still greater war.

The diplomats who will sit around a table to readjust boundary lines at the end of this war will face two alternatives—one to renew the futile rivalry of arms that has bred this war; the other, to co-operate and through a League of Nations to lead to world organization and a substitution of law for war.

These two great alternatives with their implications and philosophic bases may be so taught as to be understood by children from ten to eighteen years of age far better than they are understood by those parents who get their convictions from scare headlines; far better even than by many an educated man hide-bound by prejudice and unscientific theories of the past. Many things have been hidden from the wise and prudent professors, diplomats, editors and generals who caused this war which can be revealed to Bobbie Brown in the eighth grade. When he is twenty-one, that knowledge will count. What are some of these things?

(1) How to imagine what our opponents think. Systematically develop imagination. Many good arithmeticians have no imagination in figures, e. g. how much a million men, acres, dollars are. Imagination in figures is needed every time one reads a newspaper. Knowledge of percentage may be used only once a year. Take the town as the basis of comparison. When referring to people, money or area make comparisons

with it, e. g.: A Boston child should know that the 600,000 Americans who perish annually from preventable causes would equal all in his city. Make figures live. Develop sympathy through imagination. End quarreling by making each little brawler play he was his own opponent and write out the other's side of the dispute.

In studying our three foreign wars, ask pupils to impersonate a Briton, Mexican, Spaniard and Filipino and state their point of view. Encourage each to get the point of view of each type of our cosmopolitan population, the rich, the poor, the Indian, negro and Chinese. Let skill in writing letters such as these men would write receive as much credit as skill in singing or drawing. The life of many a college graduate has been ruined because he could not imagine how others thought and felt.

(2) Interdependence of Modern Nations.

Show how the nations through steam, electricity, wireless telegraphy, foreign investments and commerce have now become as interdependent as the parts of the human body. Define organism and organization. In the lower grades, ask children to tell of everything in their homes that comes from a foreign country, from tea to Grimms' Fairy Tales. Set them to thinking of our indebtedness to all nations past and present. Ask them to get home help in bringing in the names of the great heroes, inventors, statesmen, authors and musicians of every land. Parallel columns might be kept upon the blackboard, headed "Greece," "Italy," "England," etc., and every week some new name added to the lists with a brief story and if possible a picture to illustrate. Why should children be taught to locate the Xingu river and to spell *pyramidal* and memorize a hundred items that do not touch their lives

before they have ever heard of Darwin or Shakespeare?

Let geography be made a more human study than it was to the last generation. Let reverence and gratitude for all the human effort of which we are heir be the outcome of this study of foreign lands. Let it be remembered that the great scholar—Elihu Burritt—was drawn to his effort for world organization upon realizing profoundly the political significance of man's need of the products of every land and clime and that each nation was designed to be the other's complement.

Early training will prevent the pernicious heresy from taking root, that war can not end until human nature changes. This error, preached in pulpit, war college and editorial chair, has paralyzed effort, and relegated to some far-off age that task of world organization which alone can abolish war.

(3) Organization.

Show that mere cessation of war is not peace. Europe has had no peace since it has had conscription and been an armed camp and acted on the theory that each nation to be safe must be stronger than any other!

Peace means the organized living together among nations.

The emphasis is on nations. Consider the growth of organized living together of cities, provinces and states; give picturesque description of the little armies in walled cities of Italy that sallied forth to fight each other in Dante's day; of war between the ancient provinces of England: later, after these were united, between England and Scotland and England and Ireland, and all this bloodshed due to lack of organization and co-operation. Above all, dwell on the constitutional period of American history, the part least

studied and the most significant. Picture vividly the friction between New York and its neighbor states, due to her tariff wall. Show how our colonies were bound by a rope of sand, Georgia being practically further from Connecticut than it is now from India, Washington could travel no faster on a horse than could Moses on a camel. Picture our provincialism; our lack of a sense of unity. Then give a dramatic account of that little group of mighty statesmen behind locked doors in Independence Hall inventing a method that, unknown to them, should not only bind the colonies together but, later, forty-eight states and, eventually, the nations of the world. (See John Fiske's "Critical Period of American History.") They did not try to change human nature but simply to make it easy to do right. They tried to keep man's latent deviltry dormant by sweeping aside what created friction and securing safety and justice.

Describe the interstate quarrels, all settled by the Supreme Court so quietly that half the citizens never heard of them. Though many states tried to secede in '61, no state ever went to war with another state. Show how the United States has been a world power from the start and its constitution has been the basis of every constitution written since. Make clear that ages before true brotherhood of man will be fully achieved, an organized living together among nations may be attained as truly as an organized living together among cities, provinces and states, despite the fact that within those states and nations violence will by no means entirely cease.

(4) The Hague Conferences.

When newspapers proclaim the futility of arbitration and their elders scoff at the Peace Palace, pupils must rely on teachers for the truth. Show that, though the causes of the war lay deep, the

immediate occasion was a matter that could have been settled by the Hague Tribunal. Had the dispute been taken there, Europe would not have broken into conflagration. To sneer at the Arbitration Tribunal as if, forsooth, it were at fault is like sneering at a physician whose mad patient throws his medicine out of the window. The story of the Hague Conferences in 1899 and 1907, their real achievements and the enormous possibilities of future Conferences should be part of the teaching in every school. Each May 18, the story should be told anew as found in Gulliver's "Friendship of the Nations," in bulletins of the United States Bureau of Education; in the chapter on "The World State," in Myers' "Modern History" and in the last chapters of "A Course in Citizenship."

When the war ends, and the victims in every land face their ghastly losses, will they not demand that this hideous folly of war shall not be repeated, that the only method which can bring security shall now be tried? But if there is not widespread knowledge of the way to peace, and if our country does not lead the way, their cries may be stifled in a world that has been so long under the censor and military law that democracy will have become but a mere name.

A LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

The essential features of this league which may be the first step toward world organization can be understood by children old enough to understand American history. First, a group of nations, as large a group as possible, that are pledged to send every dispute between them to an International Court. If it be a dispute that is not covered by law, it shall be investigated by a Commission of Conciliation which shall report the facts to the whole world before the disputants can fight. This

involves a "cooling-off" time which almost certainly would prevent war altogether. The enormous value of this delay should be emphasized and illustrated by the Doggerbank episode in the war between Russia and Japan. Children are always interested in the graphic story of the Russian admiral in the North Sea who fired on poor English fishing boats thinking they were Japanese torpedo boats and then sailed away regardless, while England was ablaze with wrath and hot for revenge. The provision made at The Hague in 1899, for investigation and delay before hostilities saved the day. A committee of five admirals from different countries heard the testimony in Paris and decided that it was merely a tragic blunder. They declared that they thought the Russians ought to pay $300,000 to the widows and orphans, and this was accordingly done although there was nothing but public opinion to enforce the decision.

The League of Peace provides that if a member breaks its pledge and goes to war all the others shall unite in using economic and military pressure to restrain it. In all probability, no force would ever have to be used, for one nation would hardly defy the whole league.

In high schools, detailed study should be made of all these principles and especially of the enormous power of the economic boycott or non-intercourse. This would mean cutting off of shipping, railroad, postal and telegraphic connections, refusal of loans and cancellation of patents, copyrights and passports, with supertax or continued extra tariffs if a nation remained long obdurate. The chambers of commerce have specially endorsed this form of compulsion.

The general principles involved in the cooling-off and boycott elements of this scheme can be illustrated by playground experiences; the neces-

sity for umpiring games will teach the need of umpiring between nations.

FUNDAMENTAL MISCONCEPTIONS.

Deep-rooted, unscientific convictions about force are chiefly responsible for war. So long as most people in power think war just as inevitable as are storms and earthquakes, they create the very conditions that breed war. For fifty years a misconception of the Darwinian doctrine as applied to man has befogged the minds of scholars as well as of militarists, has deeply infected professorial teaching and blighted human progress through governmental action.

The present generation was brought up on a false interpretation of the Darwinian theory of "struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest." These two phrases were loudly heralded by all militarists as giving biologic basis for the doctrine of force. Darwin waited twelve years after the publication of the "Origin of Species" before he worked out the application of his theories to man. During that interval, sociologists as well as militarists made hasty and unwarrantable conclusions and widely proclaimed a doctrine that is the reverse of Darwinism. No one who reads the recent revelation of true Darwinism in "Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory," by George W. Nasmyth, Ph. D., can fail to realize the incalculable evil wrought for fifty years in the education of Europe in those doctrines which have logically led to the present war. True Darwinism gives the scientific basis for the golden rule and the moral law. The teacher's greatest task today is to give "in words of one syllable" the essence of the true Darwinism if he would help a bewildered humanity create a rational world.

(1) That man's inherited brute instinct causes war.

Show children that there is no war among the brutes. War means combined effort to destroy one's own kind. Only men do this abnormal thing. Brutes occasionally fight impromptu duels in the mating season, or they snarl over a bone, but they chiefly kill to eat and kill other species. Getting dinner is not war; single combat is not war. A pack of wolves never attacks another; lions do not kill lions, nor tigers kill tigers. But college graduates study physics to learn how to blow to bits the bodies of men whom they have never seen, and whose real interests are the same as theirs.

(2) That struggle for existence implies war.

Show how struggle and contest are wholesome, inevitable and endless. Multiply illustration; Peary struggling against Arctic frosts; Colonel Waring fighting yellow fever; Whitman struggling against frontier perils. Let the daily press supply the class with countless illustrations of heroic struggle against environment. If children must learn how many were wounded at Brandywine, let them also learn that 700,000 were last year wounded in industries, fighting poverty to win a living. Show how dangerous has been the confusion of thought which confounds the everlasting, necessary struggle against environment with deliberate destruction of one part of the organism of humanity by another part.

(3) That war created civilization and, as a college president declares, that "all progress has been made through war."

The latest science shows that primitive man, like the apes from whom man descended, lived on fruits and was peaceful. Only as men advanced

toward civilization and acquired tools, language, power of combining with his fellows, only as he gained foresight, became inventive and gained private property did war develop. Civilization created war, not war civilization.

All progress has been accompanied by war as well as by fire and disease, but there is no causal relation between them. Progress has been due entirely to invention, discovery, education and spiritual insight combined with industry and good will. It has come spite of war's hindrance; Columbus, Gutenberg and Watts, not Caesar, Tamerlane and Napoleon mark the world's progress.

(4) That there have been good wars.

The teacher will have no harder task than to get boys to see that it takes two sides to make a war. Their elders who prate of "righteous wars" and "just wars" always fail to see that had there been no aggression there would have been no justifiable defence. This defence is not a war but is only the excusable fifty per cent. of a total struggle which is also at least fifty per cent. unjust. Franklin's saying that there never was a good war recognizes that nothing that is half unjust can be called "good" or ever makes for progress.

Conquest cripples one producer at the expense of another, leaving the total wealth just so much less. To study fully the ramifications and philosophy of these condensed statements would give a primary school teacher more culture on vital topics than that possessed by most of the educated men of our day; yet even a child, through homely illustrations, may grasp the essence of a truth hid from more than one college president. Tell him that if Robinson Crusoe stands over Friday with a whip to make him dig, he too is a slave, chained to the spot as much as Friday. He can not go to

swim or take a nap lest Friday stop digging, but if the bright idea strikes him to make a bargain with Friday to work while he picks fruit for both, each is free and twice as much is produced. This principle should be illustrated by the pupils themselves in a score of ways.

(5) That a nation gains by injuring its neighbor's trade.

When many British newspapers are advocating permanent boycott of Germany's goods after the war and all possible injury to her trade, American children ought to be taught more than these know of elementary economics. Eighth grade pupils need to understand the following quotation from Norman Angell more than they do the rule of three: "The prosperity of an average German factory is distributed pretty evenly over some such factors as these: The capacity of a peasant in Provence who sells his olives in New York to subscribe to a South American loan, in order that a dock might be built on the Amazon to enable the manufacturer in England to sell furniture in Baku to a merchant whose wealth is due to the development of gasoline in an automobile trade in Paris." The destruction of German trade would injure both England and her allies. If German money and trade were shut out from Antwerp, the Independent declares "it would be a greater financial blow to Belgium than the German invasion."

(6) That all government is based on force.

All governments *use* force but none is *based* on it as much as on a dozen other things, to wit: consent of the governed; if most people wanted to commit burglary and murder we should need a policeman for every family. Most people obey the law willingly with no thought of the police; farming, industry, commerce, money, banks,

courts, legislatures, the press and schools support a republic. Ask pupils to tell in detail what would happen if any of these were abolished. Armies would be naked, starving mobs fighting with their fists were it not for the whole body of producers. Preparedness means the efficiency of a whole nation. When our nation had a small navy for decades we were never attacked and persuaded the great nations to arbitrate every dispute with us, e. g., the Alabama Claims and the Venezuelan Dispute.

Other dangerous fallacies are:—

(a) That armaments and defence are synonyms.

(b) That armies and navies are national police and must endure as long as city police.*

When a man is thirty it will make little difference whether he remembers the rule for the dative case. But his own life and his nation's may depend upon whether his generation has learned the antidotes for the poison of war fallacies; whether he puts the nation above humanity and the moral law or whether he feels that "Above all nations is Humanity."—[Reprinted from the Journal of Education.]

*For refutation of these apply for leaflets to the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BOOKS.

1. Friendship of Nations. Illustrated. Gulliver Ginn & Co., Boston. $.75
2. Course in Citizenship..... 1.25
   Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
3. Swords and Ploughshares. Illustrated..... 1.00
4. The Great Illusion. Norman Angell..... 1.00
5. The Danger of Half Preparedness. Norman Angell ..... .50
6. Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory. Nasmyth 1.50
   G. P. Putnam's, New York City.

PAMPHLETS.

Primer of the Peace Movement..... $.10
American Peace Society,
Colorado Building, Washington.

Outlines of Lessons on War and Peace..... .05
World Peace Foundation,
40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston.

For free leaflets and single copies of free pamphlets apply to The World Peace Foundation, the Woman's Peace Party, Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, and American Association for International Conciliation, Sub-Station 84, New York City.

Copies of this pamphlet may be obtained at two cents each or $1.50 per hundred at the headquarters of the Woman's Peace Party, 116 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., or of The New England Publishing Company, 6 Beacon Street, Boston.

(9 nov.)

SECURITY AND WORLD PEACE

A Radio Debate in
Boston, October, 1925

7578.543

By

Mrs. LUCIA AMES MEAD
and
Rev. RAYMOND GRANT

WASHINGTON, D. C.
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR
1926

4

NATIONAL CAPITAL PRESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

Security and World Peace

The following debate on Security and World Peace by Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead and Rev. Raymond Grant was given over the Boston WNAC Radio, under the auspices of the Federation of Churches of Greater Boston, October, 1925, and printed in full in the Boston Herald.

MR. GRANT.—Good evening, Mrs. Mead. I understand that you are a pacifist and are going to show us how a wicked world can gain security and peace by the Golden Rule. Suppose you begin.

MRS. MEAD.—As to being a pacifist, I never say whether I am one or not until I know what one means by the word. Of course, the word means simply peacemaker. Pacifist is a very vague term, as vague as the word "Christian." When you say "Christian," you do not know whether it refers to Mrs. Eddy, or the Pope, or Theodore Parker, or John Wesley. The word pacifist has been dragged in the dust and is supposed by many to denote a fool or coward, one who would not risk his skin to defend his country. One of the Nobel peace prize winners said, "Peace, according to pacifism, means a condition of organized living together among nations."

I am interested in organized living together between nations as well as organized living together between individuals, between cities and between states; and I believe in taking the first step before the fourth. The first step is to enter the world court. Do I understand that you are a militarist?

MR. GRANT.—Certainly not. Pacifists malign us soldiers as much as you think we malign them. Soldiers detest war and want no more of it. But we see that as there are bandits and thugs in our communities, so there are bandit nations trying to grab other people's territory.

We know that there always has been war and that, until you can change human nature and get rid of selfishness, you are always going to have war. Man is the highest order of animal, and like other animals he fights and always will fight; there is a great deal of the tiger still in us. I say, stand guard and throttle the foe that dares invade our borders. Wars are as certain as floods and earthquakes. You can't change human nature.

I don't call all pacifists cowards. I have seen Quakers under shot and shell carrying off the wounded. But I think their doctrine of non-resistance is too good for this old planet. I'm not a militarist. I'm simply a practical patriot and know that war is going to come in the future as it has in the past and that if we don't get good and ready for it, we shall play the fool and lose out.

"Brutes Kill to Get Dinner and That Is Not War"

MRS. MEAD.—That was just what I supposed you thought, for that doctrine is preached at West Point and Annapolis, and is sincerely believed in by all militarists. A militarist is not one who wants war. No one wants war. But every militarist holds just that philosophy, and that is what makes him a militarist. You raise points that must be taken up in detail. You believe that as animals kill, so man likewise kills. But did you ever think of the world-wide difference between killing your own species and killing other species? The tiger, lion and snake act normally. They are out to get dinner and they kill other species. That is normal. Brutes never go en masse to kill their own species. A pack of wolves goes to the sheep-fold, not to fight another pack of wolves. Getting dinner is not war.

War is the collective destruction of one's own species. The butcher kills pigs and cattle and acts normally. The man who trains to use the bayonet on a target that will wiggle—one of his own fellow men—is doing the abnormal

thing. Man studies science so as to be able to poison or mangle those of his own species with whom he has no quarrel, whom he never saw before. War, like slavery and witchcraft, will end as soon as men think differently. There is no biological basis for it. It is merely a question of thinking. International war could be ended in this generation.

MR. GRANT.—Isn't that a Utopian dream? How can you abolish in your lifetime what has been a dominant passion since man began to be man?

MRS. MEAD.—Science is now refuting that old assumption. The caveman never went to war.

He couldn't, because he did not know enough to. Man had first to invent language; then weapons; to acquire private property; to learn to organize and subject himself to discipline and orders. That probably took him 100,000 years. Scientists now show that the greater part of man's existence on the globe was before he knew how to use collective force. War is a comparatively modern thing. It is a product of civilization, like slavery, forgery, graft, opium culture, intemperance, smuggling and many evil things. It is an acquired, an unnatural accomplishment employed by the most highly technical and clever nations.

MR. GRANT.—But what ground have you for thinking that, with the tremendous power which the nations have today, they are ever going to give it up? When Asia and Africa learn as much science as we, shall we ever dare to lay down arms?

Points to History to Show Spread of Peace

MRS. MEAD.—Study history. Immense areas of the world's surface have already achieved peace within their borders where formerly, in Dante's day, one city fought another city and Italy and Germany were all divided into tiny sections, every now and then warring with each other.

Now each has common customs, a common flag and a common army. A united Italy and a united Germany are strong and at peace within their borders. All this has come about without any change of human nature, nothing but larger interests, a larger allegiance, new ideas.

The greatest illustration is the 400,000,000 black, white, brown and yellow people under the Union Jack who speak 150 different languages, and have scores of religions. They keep the peace, as do the 110,000,000 people under the stars and stripes. Once we had customs duties between New York and her neighbors; we were suspicious and quarrelsome. We got a substitute for war, got to thinking differently and, since we became a republic, there has been no war between one State and another.

MR. GRANT.—How about Ireland and India? Do they love England? Isn't India held down by main force? May there not be an awful explosion any day in the Mohammedan world that will require all of the British army and navy to suppress?

MRS. MEAD.—Perhaps. But the point I am making is that an enormous area of the world's surface has achieved organizations which have suppressed warfare between states, even in such countries as ours where murder and lawlessness within the States are phenomenal. Where there has been gain in security it has come through organization and the extension of common interest. Murder and other spasmodic and individual violence will be the last forms of violence to be put under control. War between nations can end in this generation. Civil war, riots, revolution may continue indefinitely; they are in another category, but will be much lessened as soon as international war is taboo.

China with Peaceful Policy Now Football of Nations

MR. GRANT.—What I want to ask is, do you want to chinafy the world? China had enormous population and

a peaceful policy for thousands of years, but she is now the football of the nations.

If she had had a good modern navy, do you suppose that Japan would have imposed on her the 21 demands? Would she have ignominiously had opium culture forced on her, and control of her tariffs, and an extraterritorial court? Would western nations have got such concessions? China has tried non-resistance and it has been her ruin.

MRS. MEAD.—Had China, which is rich in coal and iron and natural resources, had western science and known how to exploit her riches herself and had she had central organization, she could have held her own with all the nations of the earth, navy or no navy. She has been imposed on because over 90 per cent of her people are illiterate and hampered by a frightfully difficult method of writing and communication. Yet, spite of this, her peaceful boycott of foreign goods, her proud refusal to work for the foreigners, now are making them eat humble pie, as much as would a naval engagement. The old warlike nations have disappeared, and great Spain has become a fifth-rate power without colonies, and all the nations that fought in the world war are buried in debt. China alone of all the ancients survives. She has kept her place 4000 years. Better a live dog than a dead lion.

MR. GRANT.—You say that collective armed force is modern; that it is abnormal; that, if we properly organize, we can get rid of it within a generation and without any change of human nature. Now I happen to remember the Boston police strike. We tried an experiment that we shall never try again. We went without police for nearly 24 hours. We sha'n't soon forget the looting and the scare we had.

Now all we want an army or navy for is to act as a national police. We are not aggressors. We are not

wanting to conquer any territory. We are and always have been a peace-loving people. But we are the richest nation in the world, and nations don't like a creditor who insists on being paid. Do you want us to surrender or do you want us to have a national police force of cruisers and submarines and air-planes to protect our women and children and save us from a shameful invasion?

"We Shall Always Need Police, Sheriffs, Militia"

MRS. MEAD.—Police functions and those of army and navy are as far apart as the east is from the west. Police we shall always need. Sheriffs and state militia we shall always need. Their function is to protect and to promote justice. They are not rival bodies. The police of Lowell are not preparing to defend themselves against the police of Fall River. The militia of Massachusetts are not expecting to be attacked by the police of Connecticut. Of course it is the business of police to arrest criminals and take them to court, but they are equally engaged in kindly, protective work,—guiding the traffic, etc.

Note, I say "court." There, judge and jury settle the punishment according to law. The police are not allowed to punish; they give their testimony and return to their beat. Do armies or navies ever send to court? Certainly not. They are the instruments of nations that refuse to go to court and say, "We will settle this question of boundary or honor by poison gas and explosives."

Armies and navies are always rival bodies. We shall give up ours when there is a general agreement. Sometime we may have an international police, but we have none yet.

It would be employed only in the remote contingency of an organized world calling upon the different quotas to unite in driving home an invader that refused to arbitrate.

MR. GRANT.—I guess you are right about the distinction

between police functions and army functions, but you don't say how we are to protect New York. What force is going to keep the Woolworth building from being blown to pieces if Uncle Sam holds his hands and invites invasion?

MRS. MEAD.—It is certain that we shall not abolish armies and navies until other nations do. But that is no reason why we should now insist on having a navy as large as Great Britain's. Our coastline is less than half that which Great Britain must protect. Great Britain cannot feed herself. If any one needs a navy, she does to protect her merchant marine.

We are the safest nation in the world—the only one with a great ocean on each side and a northern boundary absolutely safe as long as it remains unguarded. In all our five foreign wars, we lost in battle fewer than we have had murdered in the last ten years. This is an astounding fact. It shows how very slight our danger has been from foreigners, however it may have been with other nations who stand in each other's way. Why a well man should take as much medicine as a sick man I never could see. Our big navy is unnecessary, burdensome to tax-payers. It is looked upon outside as an evidence of growing militarism, kept up simply to make a show and get a certain prestige.

As for our riches being an inducement for attack, a rich man is one thing, a rich nation quite another. A bandit may carry off a pay roll. No nation can carry off our forests, mines, fields, factories and sky-scrapers. We are the goose that lays the golden egg. Those who don't like us want to borrow from us.

Secretary Hughes said last year: "So far as we can see into the future, the United States is not in the slightest danger of aggression. In no single power and in no possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security."

There is no danger of any one's wanting to destroy New York until the nations want to stop borrowing.

Mr. Grant Cites Judgment of Expert Military Men

MR. GRANT.—Aren't you ignoring the judgment of experienced military men, men who have spent years as experts in studying this whole subject of security? If you do not think my position sound, what have you to say to these men?

Admiral Rodgers declares: "War itself is an integral part of law. War is the agency whereby law is made to prevail when it is disrupted by evil-doers."

The Secretary of War in an address at West Point is reported as saying: "If it were not for the restraining effect of military establishments of the nations of the world, an indescribable state of chaos would result and civilization would be rapidly terminated through self-destruction."

Says Gen. J. G. Harbord: "War still remains the supreme act of the state. Permanent, universal peace still remains as an ideal lost in inaccessible distances, until envy, malice, lust and avarice have disappeared from the human heart."

MRS. MEAD.—These statements are typical of the dangerous sophistry common among technicians in the art and science of war. A man may understand all about mustard gas and tanks and machine guns, but it does not follow that his 30 or 40 years of playing war games gives him any power of judgment on the questions that I am now discussing. The militarist focuses his attention on possible enemies. He studies nothing about substitutes for war. His theories are based on false assumptions, and he is just as sincere as he is confused in his thinking. No one should blame him for not being a statesman or a psychologist or a judge. I only blame him when he goes outside his legitimate province and propounds his guesses like an oracle, and fools the public which stands in awe of epaulettes.

As well go to a shoemaker to ask how many shoes you

need as to ask a military man what appropriations are "adequate." None are ever adequate. The distinguished men whom you quote are pitifully confused in their thinking when they get outside their specialty. They would better listen to President Coolidge: "It will always be impossible to harmonize justice and war."

MR. GRANT.—Well, you haven't yet told me how you expect we can obtain security and peace. Your great women's organizations at the conference on "The Cause and Cure of War" spent three days discussing the causes of war—overpopulation, lack of raw materials, tariff barriers, bad education, etc. How do you expect to root these causes out so as to stop war within a generation?

"We Cannot Root Out Causes of Disputes"

MRS. MEAD.—We cannot root out causes of disputes. Those will continue indefinitely, as they continue between individuals and between states. But nations can stop settling these disputes by explosives. Disputes should not be confounded with war. We need not root out the causes of disputes before we can stop war.

MR. GRANT.—Then you think the possibility of ending international war within a generation depends on organization?

MRS. MEAD.—Yes; it depends on the same measures which ended war between individuals, between cities and between states. We have done all that without any change in human nature. Get 500 leading statesmen of the world to provide adequate world organization and we should end war. World peace depends on a very few people. The same principles that created a United States can create a united world. You have the last word.

MR. GRANT.—Our time is up and we recognize our inability to deal with so momentous an issue in the brief period allotted to us. We must leave the matter for public consideration.

Price of this pamphlet:
$30.00 per 1,000; 5 cents per copy prepaid.

l

International School of Peace

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP

7 S 78.543

BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF PEACE
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON
1910

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrors, its sufferings, its impoverishment, and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.—HORACE MANN.

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.—LONGFELLOW.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP.

By Lucia Ames Mead.

How to attain peace between nations is a problem not to be settled by Dreadnoughts, but by psychology. As a man thinketh, so is he. If he has delirium tremens and thinks himself threatened by rattlesnakes, he acts accordingly. If he has been under the influence of the 727 active and retired officers of the army and navy in Washington who, in the words of Justice Brewer, "are gradually transforming the capital of the country into a military or naval centre," he will doubtless share their point of view and see a possible enemy in nations with which we have always been at peace. Nothing is so important as that men shall think right, and especially that the rising generation shall be well instructed upon the momentous international issues of our new time. Happily, within the past few years several very encouraging educational movements have been initiated in the United States, which give promise of creating a different psychology in the citizen of the future as regards the whole question of national dangers and national defence. It is the purpose of this paper to give an account of some of these movements.

The American School Peace League held its first annual meeting at Denver in July, 1909, in connection with the convention of the National Educational Association. At the annual business meeting of the latter association, which represents the educators of the country, resolutions were

passed unanimously and earnestly indorsing the League, and urging all teachers to co-operate with it.

The origin of this splendidly organized association was most interesting. When the first American National Peace Congress met at Carnegie Hall, New York, in April, 1907, one of the public school teachers, Miss Mary J. Pierson, who had arranged a great children's meeting in New York in connection with the International Peace Congress of 1904, took the initiative for a greater meeting in connection with this Congress. By selling the boxes in Carnegie Hall to private schools, the expenses were practically covered. Under the chairmanship of Superintendent Maxwell, between four and five thousand pupils, with some delegates from neighboring cities, crowded the hall, and listened with delight to music from a chorus of five hundred voices and to addresses from Baron D'Estournelles de Constant and other speakers from home and abroad. The enthusiasm with which the boys and girls entered into the spirit of the occasion was so impressive that it seemed imperative it should not be permitted to dissipate. A committee was appointed to provide for a continuance of the work so well begun. Mr. Carnegie, who was the president of the Congress, offered $1,000 a year for ten years, provided this sum was doubled. This was accomplished, and the American School Peace League began its work in 1908, with Superintendent Van Sickle, of Baltimore, as president and a long list of eminent educators on its council and committees. The work of organization was accomplished by the League's able secretary, Mrs. Fanny Fern Andrews, of Boston.[1] Its committees on history, on publication, on meetings and discussion, on the press, and on international relations represent nearly every State in the Union. Prizes aggregating $300 have been offered for the three best essays presented

[1] Address, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston.

by seniors in normal and preparatory schools on such subjects as "The United States, the Exemplar of an Organized World," and "The History of International Arbitration."

The purpose of the League is "to promote through the schools and the educational public of America the interests of international justice and fraternity." It works through the teachers rather than directly with pupils. It aims to supplement the normal school training so as to prepare future teachers to give instruction in history, patriotism, literature, and geography from the point of view necessitated by new world-conditions. It aims to color the teacher's thought rather than to impose new burdens on the already overcrowded curriculum and to demand time for specific peace instruction. Only on May 18—Peace Day—will it ask that an hour or two be set aside to teach the new history of arbitration, not yet incorporated in text-books, and to discuss other substitutes for war. Specialists are now at work preparing material for use on these occasions. The International School of Peace will publish various valuable works. The rapid growth of a spectacular patriotism which concerns itself chiefly with what President Woodrow Wilson has called "genuflections before the flag," and puts the emphasis upon externals to the exclusion of what is vital, has of late been marked. The aim of the League is to modify this so as to deepen the spirit of service of country as against mere pride of country, and to show that service of country is chiefly needed to fight the constant foes within our midst rather than the external foes who, in our history of 120 years, have slaughtered altogether in our three foreign wars less than one-tenth the number slain every year by the one preventable disease of tuberculosis. In addition to work in normal schools, the League aims to supply speakers to teachers' conventions and to enroll without fee the great body of teachers who appreciate its purpose and desire literature on the subject.

It will also endeavor to have adequate literature on the subject placed in public libraries, and as soon as possible will seek to enlist other countries in similar national leagues. A Southern branch has been formed, with Professor P. P. Claxton, of Knoxville, Tenn., as president, and fourteen state branches with corresponding committees have been formed. The resources of the League were much increased during the last year. Mr. Ginn, the founder of the International School of Peace, contributed $1,000, and Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, another public-spirited citizen of Massachusetts, gave $5,000. But, to reach adequately the five hundred thousand teachers of the country, an annual income is required of $25,000,—less than the annual repairs on two torpedo boats.

The League, judging from its first year of splendid activity, promises to be one of the most influential organizations in America or in the world for the promotion of international good will. It will make no extravagant claims. It will teach the child to honor the men who fought for their country's independence and union; but it will make a clear distinction between past wars, many of which were inevitable, and future wars, which, with our present legal substitutes for war, will be criminal. It will show the difference between civil war, lynching, and riots, which may possibly occur for an indefinite time, and international war, which, without any change of human nature, can be ended soon. It will teach both teacher and pupil the significance of Garrison's words, "My countrymen are all mankind," and, without asking a moment more of school time, will accomplish its results by giving a different tone and emphasis to a large part of the school work.

At the Mohonk Conference of 1905 Dr. Daniel C. Gilman initiated a movement for the introduction of peace propaganda into colleges and universities. He affirmed that "the opinions brought out there at the Mohonk Conference

are those that ought to be carried by an organized effort into all the colleges and universities of the land. "If," he said, "you can get one-tenth of the enthusiasm that the young men bestow upon the athletic field directed to the study of these great international questions, the victory is ours. I would have the educated young men and women of our country grow up breathing the air of international arbitration as freely and as naturally as they do the air that supports their life." As a result of Dr. Gilman's suggestion, a committee on colleges and universities was appointed, of which Pres. Benj. Ide Wheeler, Pres. E. A. Alderman, Pres. James B. Angell, Hon. Seth Low, Pres. L. Clark Seelye, and Hon. Andrew D. White are members. The correspondence with colleges has been carried on by the corresponding secretary of the Conference, Mr. H. C. Phillips, of Mohonk. This committee has incited about 250 colleges and universities to the commemoration of Peace Day,—May 18,—to the giving of special lectures on the peace movement, or to arrangements for debates or contests of various kinds, prizes having been offered in some colleges. Hon. Andrew D. White, in submitting the report in 1909, called attention to the special donation by Mr. John R. Lindgren, of Chicago, of $25,000 to be spent in North-western University in educational work to promote international peace; also to the publication by the Carnegie Institution of Research at Washington of a series of the great classics of international law, which, when complete, are to be placed in the library of each important college and university in the United States. Said the honored speaker, "We want to work this idea of arbitration into the very warp and woof of American thought; and there is no better way than through the colleges and universities of the land." His recommendation was that a lecturer be provided to give special addresses on the subject in various institutions.

In connection with this Mohonk college work an annual

prize of $100 has latterly been offered, provided by a Harvard student, Mr. Pugsley, for the best essay on International Arbitration by an undergraduate student of any American college or university. Many essays have been written in the competition; and the admirable essay by a student of Johns Hopkins, awarded in 1909, is printed in the Mohonk report of that year. This year the prize essayist was a Harvard student. One remembers in this connection that Charles Sumner bequeathed $1,000 to Harvard for an annual prize there for the best essay on Universal Peace.

The Intercollegiate Peace Association, due to the initiative of President Byers, of Goshen College, and Professor Russell, of Earlham College, both of Indiana, is a body composed of representatives of about seventy colleges and universities of the Middle West "united for the promotion of organized activities among the students and educators in support of the International Arbitration and Peace Movement." Beginning with an enrollment of eight colleges and universities in 1905, it has developed year by year in the States of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and it hopes eventually to enroll the colleges and universities of all the States. The main work of the Association is in intercollegiate and interstate oratorical contests for prizes upon subjects which bear upon some phase of the question of international peace. At the National Peace Congress held in Chicago in May, 1909, one session, presided over by Dean Vincent of Chicago University, was devoted to the third annual interstate Intercollegiate Oratorical Contest. The judges included such well-known persons as President David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University and Miss Jane Addams. Five representatives of as many colleges contested, their subjects being "The Significance of a Permanent Peace Congress," "The Evolution of World Peace," "Justice and Peace," "Interna-

tional Arbitration and Peace," and "America, the Exemplar of Peace." The prizes offered were $75 and $50, respectively, for first and second prizes. The contestants impressed their audience with the fact that they were not debating for or against a proposition which they might or might not believe, but that they were expressing their profound conviction. Between $700 and $800 was offered in 1909 for prizes alone in the preliminary and final contests. In 1907 over $2,000 was raised for carrying on the work. Many students who have contested in recent years have become permanently interested in a subject hitherto new to them, and some of them would gladly devote their lives to the peace cause at pecuniary sacrifice, were the way open to them. Here is a field to be peculiarly commended to the attention of the wealthy friends of the peace cause. With larger funds for prizes and paid secretarial service, this organization would soon win the co-operation of every college and university in the land, and would yearly gain hundreds as permanent advocates of the system which substitutes law for war. Its devoted secretary, Mr. George Fulk,[1] has given much unpaid service to the promotion of this work. In 1907 he carried to the Second Hague Conference a memorial representing over 22,000 students and over 1,600 professors. He visited students in several of the principal European universities, as a result of which negotiations were entered into later for the alliance between the Corda Fratres of Europe and the Cosmopolitan Clubs of the United States.

A movement of great promise is that of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, which, from a little club of eighteen students in 1903, has developed to a powerful body of over two thousand young men, representing almost sixty different countries, in 1910. Its modest beginning was in the apartments of a

[1] Address, Cerro Gordo, Ill.

young Japanese student in the University of Wisconsin, where was founded an International Club composed of sixteen foreign and two native students. Although clubs composed of foreigners of some one nationality were previously common, the idea of a club in which all foreign students should intermingle was new, and at first excited scepticism as to its success. But as a result of the attempt, born of faith and good will, the club of eighteen has grown to eighty-five, representing twenty countries. The contagion of faith and good will has now spread to nearly thirty colleges and universities. In 1907 a National Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs was formed. Its illustrated annuals are a revelation of a mighty power for international fraternity within our midst. As one studies in detail the faces of these picked men, future leaders of science and politics in China, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, India, the Philippines, South Africa, and other lands, as well as the frank, alert faces of our native collegians, one realizes that this club, like the similar ones elsewhere, is a melting-pot for whatever prejudice, suspicion, and indifference may have once lurked in them. To-day these men from all quarters of the globe, by the common bond of intellectual interests and common recreation, are coming, without any loss of patriotism as concerns their native lands, to think of themselves first of all as citizens of the world,—members of the brotherhood of man. "Above all nations is humanity," the striking utterance of Goldwin Smith, is the motto of the club, well chosen and far-reaching in its influence upon other clubs of narrow limitations. President Eliot has declared that the Harvard Cosmopolitan Club is the most interesting in the university. This numbers over two hundred members. One of the most successful chapters, that at Cornell, has begun the erection of a beautiful building, which will cost $30,000 and will admirably house the representatives of over twenty nations who meet in cordial good fellowship

in its Cosmopolitan Club. A prominent member, who expects to study in Germany in 1910–11, is carefully planning to use his utmost endeavor to transplant the Cosmopolitan Club movement into the university which he is to enter there. As a rule, only one-third or one-half of the membership can be American, but there is a desire to increase this proportion, as foreigners chiefly seek acquaintance with Americans. The latter are selected from those students who have sympathy with foreigners, and these have shown themselves careful not to take too many offices nor use undue influence. For the most part, the foreign students are exceedingly brainy and courteous men, more interested in professional work than in amusement,—in short, picked men, whose future influence is sure to be great, especially when they come from the Orient.

At this moment, when hundreds of millions beyond the Pacific are awakening to the significance of western science, with the new hope of throwing off the burden of poverty, of developing national resources and achieving representative government in the near future, the impressions which these thoughtful youths carry back to convey to their compatriots become a matter of world importance. What they gain by hard labor in laboratory and class-room is of even less importance than what they acquire by daily contact with our American life. That they should be presented the best aspects of it, that they should make warm friendship with Americans, and carry home a conviction that this nation stands for justice and peace and good will, is a matter of national importance. It is incumbent not only on the American members of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, but on churches and other associations, to see that special courtesies and hospitality are offered to these quiet, keen observers, sent here now from China in increasing numbers by the fund returned from the Boxer indemnity. Mr. Guoktsai Chao, of Shanghai, of the University of Wisconsin, thus

gives his reason for choosing that institution: "The ignorance of China on the part of Americans has been the cause of numerous deplorable misunderstandings and is the result of lack of intercourse between the two peoples. To remedy this situation, nothing can be better than for the Chinese students to mingle with the Americans, and let them learn from the living representatives instead of from the colored tales of China. Thus, when I learned there were very few Chinese students in Madison, I came."

It is interesting to observe that from this university its baseball team was sent to Japan in August, 1909, to play a series of ten games with the Keio university team. It was royally entertained, and served as one little link to bind together in sympathy the two nations whose friendship will be one of their strongest assets.

The meetings of the clubs sometimes are for lectures, but are largely social, with musical and dramatic features supplied in turn by each nationality. The flags of all the nations represented decorate the walls, and curios are presented and quaint customs and dances are illustrated from time to time. Here a Russian Jew in an engineering course sits beside a Japanese in the course in political economy, both listening to a Filipino band playing native airs, or to a North American talking football or politics, or a South American discussing coffee-raising or Bolivar. Each is for the time emancipated from self-consciousness and the limitations of his race and native district, and in turn is teacher and pupil of his fellows. Whether one is Jewish or Buddhist matters little, if he only shows himself a "jolly good fellow."

In order to correct erroneous impressions in their native lands concerning America, many members have pledged themselves to give accounts in their native papers and periodicals of American life and its educational privileges. "There never was a more loyal son of an alma mater than the foreign student," says Louis P. Lochner, of the University of

Wisconsin, himself a prime mover in the Cosmopolitan Club movement. "They cannot help but carry home with them the message of peace on earth, good will to men." Mr. Lochner edits the *Cosmopolitan Student*, the new monthly organ of the clubs, and is the general secretary of the association.[1]

The Cosmopolitan Club leaders have been of great service to the body of European students, banded together for somewhat similar purposes, known as the "Corda Fratres." At the last biennial meeting of the latter society, held at The Hague in August, 1909, representatives of our Cosmopolitan Clubs, at a critical period in the history of Corda Fratres, when two elements were discordant, were asked to act as umpires, and succeeded so admirably that the society took a new lease of life. Its central bureau is to remain no longer in the hands of one nationality, but must be moved about. In 1911 the Bureau will come to America. This International Federation of Students, whose motto, "Corda Fratres," gives it its title, was founded at Turin in 1898, but not very successfully organized until September, 1905, at Liège, Belgium. At first the Federation had been divided into national sections, but last year it was reorganized so as to discard national lines and to form self-governing local associations as the units of the Federation. This has sixty-three local chapters, with fifteen thousand members of various European universities, though few, if any, in Germany and England. With the accession of forty thousand French students and our Cosmopolitan Clubs, their numbers nearly tripled in 1909. The principal object of the International Federation of Students is "to protect and promote the idea of solidarity and fraternity among students." Any student, regardless of his political or religious ideas, has a right to become a mem-

[1] Address, Madison, Wis.

ber, if he is registered in an institution of higher learning. Each member pledges himself to promote the spirit of international union among the youth and to try to "dissipate the prejudices and hatred which render states reciprocally hostile and always on a war footing," and to promote the work of peace and arbitration between nations. It is also the object of the Federation "to put in correspondence the students themselves," and to "ensure reciprocally hosts and friends in the large cities upon the occasion of travel." The official language of the Federation is French, together with the language of the country where the Congress is held. International congresses are held once in two years. Austrians, Italians, and French have hitherto been most in evidence in the work of the Federation. No practical results have as yet been achieved which equal those of the American Cosmopolitan Clubs. With the co-operation now of this able body on this side of the Atlantic and with the eloquent Mr. Pierre Julien as president,[1] it gives promise of great usefulness. Its executive committee has representatives from France, Italy, Hungary, Holland, Sweden, the United States, and South America. Every second term an American will be awarded the international presidency.

Another European movement just in embryo promises large results. At the initiative of a student at Kiel University, who has taken a leading part in the body in the German universities known as the Freiestudentenschaft, a movement has been set on foot to arrange an interchange of visits between German and English students, beginning with a visit of German students to England in the summer of 1910, to be followed the next summer by a visit of English students to Germany. The Freiestudentenschaft organization was founded ten years ago by Professor Harms, of Kiel University. It has now thirty-seven chapters, includ-

[1] Address, 15 Rue de la Bucheris, Paris.

ing those in technical high schools as well as universities. The organization supplies the social need of many in that half of the whole student body which is outside the regular "corps,"—the organizations celebrated for their social functions and duelling. Among these students are the more scholarly and liberal-minded, who eschew the dissipations of the corps life. Among these, if anywhere in the German universities, may one find those who can be approached in the interest of international friendship. Many of these thoughtful young men's ideals are affected by the present collision between the monarchical and socialistic extremists. Nothing could be better for these young chemists, engineers, and philologists than to spend three months breathing the free air of England and seeing how the people are not kept helplessly in the dark as to the plans and policies of their government and how they play the master with their elected servants. A centre having been established in London, each German student will have the companionship of some English student in his own particular field of study, and they will make examinations of factories or cathedrals or mines, as the case may be, and pursue their study and research together. Who can doubt that this friendly companionship for a summer will go far to open the eyes of both to the immense field of interest which they have in common? And when the English students later, in turn, leave smoky London with its square miles of squalor for the clean and splendid capital of Germany, and spend a month without ever seeing a drunken beggar, as they study the order, thrift, and energy of the marvellous German people, will they not be learning lessons more important than any which their laboratories can teach? Though no word be exchanged about peace or arbitration, the preliminary steps to these will have been taken when the youth who are perhaps the future leaders of two empires have come to an understanding. The infrequency with which English students study in Ger-

many, as compared with the Scotch, doubtless has some connection with the fact that the humiliating fear of German invasion, which rose to a positive panic in 1909, has chiefly marked southern England and been laughed at north of Berwick-on-Tweed as "a fit of the English sillies." Profound misconception of their own race upon the other side of the North Sea and general ignorance of their language, together with the fatal refusal to agree with Germany and the United States, at the Second Hague Conference, to the inviolability of private property at sea in time of war, are compelling Great Britain, and through her the world, to maintain the burden of armaments which is staggering civilization.

The annual interchange of professorships between the Universities of Berlin and Harvard and Columbia, instituted on Germany's side by Emperor William, have already produced a noticeable impression and accentuated good feeling and mutual respect. Professor Felix Adler, on his return from his lectures on the Roosevelt foundation in Berlin, said: "Even among the educated classes of one country it is astounding how little real knowledge there is of the deeper life of their neighbors, of their tendencies, their aspirations, of what may be called their genius. Here are the great civilized peoples living side by side, and yet ignorant of all that is deepest in each other's life. The academic mission on which I was sent was essentially in the interests of international peace. . . . The great peril that hangs over the civilized world to-day is the very destruction of our civilization in some general conflagration. In the long run the true safeguard is the removal of suspicion, the mitigation of mutual aversions that separate peoples, and the bringing them to a better understanding. I have never seen a set of men—and women, too—so eager as the German students, so eager and so just, on the whole. As long as I live, I shall not forget that lecture in the old University of Berlin, with

that throng of eager faces, that electric tension in the atmosphere, that challenge on their part, and that generous and large response."

Another movement known as the World's Student Christian Federation, though not ostensibly a peace movement, is destined to be of very great service in bringing together in brotherly fellowship much of the best of the student body of the world. The Federation, established in 1895, in Sweden, by a combination of five great intercollegiate Christian Associations of America, Great Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia, now includes 2,060 Associations, with a membership of 138,000 students and professors. These are grouped in eleven national or international Christian students' movements; but, counting the constituent movements, the Federation now comprises and unites twenty-one national Christian students' movements. Four years ago only two or three countries had paid secretaries giving their whole time to the work. Now there are nine countries having such workers. In 1908 eighty national or sectional conferences were held, with 13,000 delegates. Among these were the Volunteer Conventions at Nashville, Liverpool, Halle, and Capetown, the Social Problems Conference at Matlock, and, most noteworthy of all, the Conference at Tokyo. The total number of the official publications of the student movements is 720, an increase of 50 per cent. in the last few years. The number of periodicals is twenty-four, the latest additions being *Fede e Vita* of the Italian movement, the English edition of *China's Young Men*, and the *Student World*, a quarterly, published in New York City. Gifts from Americans have provided for more than a dozen hostels for Japanese students, many large gifts coming directly from missionary funds. Such donations as Mr. Kennedy's of one million dollars and a half to Robert College on the Bosphorus are destined indirectly to do enormous service in promoting international

friendship. The marked increase of interest in social questions in these Christian students' organizations indicates much study of racial peculiarities and international problems. This interest in social problems, says the general secretary, Mr. John R. Mott,[1] "bids fair to be one of the truest and greatest services rendered by the student movements to the world." The leaders welcome this new interest and are the prime movers in promoting it. It is expected of every secretary that he should have an international outlook. In South Africa the secretary has chiefly devoted himself to promoting good feeling between the races. Japanese student secretaries have had enormous influence in addressing student bodies in India. "The peace spirit is everywhere dominant in the student movement, and all are enjoined to go forth as apostles of unity." One familiar with the movement says: "Probably no single factor in our generation has really done more to promote international fellowship and kindly feeling. When it is remembered that its membership is composed almost exclusively of educated men, of those who are to be the leaders of the new generation, the importance of this achievement is even more apparent."

While we survey the new educational movements, we must not forget the distinctly educational work carried on for years by the American Peace Society as a part of its regular activity. It took the initiative in promoting the observance of Peace Day in the schools of the country; its critical report on the text-books of history used in the schools did its part to hasten the salutary reform in that field now going on; and many of its publications are of great value to teachers.

The International School of Peace, founded by Edwin Ginn, the educational publisher, will, as its name implies,

[1] Address, 124 East 28th Street, New York City.

devote itself mainly to work of an educational character. It will co-operate with existing organizations doing educational work—Mr. Ginn has assisted liberally the School Peace League and the Cosmopolitan Club movement—and it will open new lines of work clearly needed. One of its regular departments will be devoted expressly to work in the schools and colleges. Its multiplying publications will serve other organizations as well as its own direct activities. Its International Library, begun several years ago and rapidly growing, already furnishes a considerable body of peace literature; and it has just begun the publication of a large series of pamphlets, many of which will be of peculiar value to teachers and the schools. It welcomes correspondence with teachers and every suggestion as to service which it may possibly render in the educational field.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF PEACE
BY GINN AND COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET, BOSTON

SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference. Mailing price, $1.65

MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents

SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague. Mailing price, $2.20

HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, $1.65

WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents

DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ. Mailing price, 60 cents

BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents

WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents

CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents

Messrs. GINN AND COMPANY have also published for the International School of Peace the following works in pamphlet form

BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents

A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews — By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents

PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers. — By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents

Returned to L. A. Mead
19 Eutaw St.
Brookline, Mass.

World Peace Foundation
Pamphlet Series

OUTLINE OF LESSONS ON

WAR AND PEACE

7578.543

BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

1. The Nature of War.
2. Common Fallacies about War and Peace.
3. National Dangers and National Defense.
4. The Modern War System and its Cost.
5. The Great Illusion.
6. Early History of the Peace Movement.
7. The Two Hague Conferences.
8. Arbitration and a World Congress.
9. Various Ways of Preventing War.
10. Patriotism and Internationalism.
11. Education and the Peace Movement.
12. The Moral Damage of War.
13. New Peace Agencies.

Published Bimonthly by the
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
40 MT. VERNON STREET, BOSTON

February, 1915
Vol. V. No. 1. Part II

Entered as second-class matter January 15, 1913, at the post-office at Boston, Mass., under the Act of August 24, 1912

FOREWORD.

The second edition of the "Outline of Lessons on War and Peace" is published while the greatest tragedy of all the ages is being enacted and in a year which may be the most critical in human history. Of the eight nations which own nine-tenths of the armaments of the world, six are at war; the seventh, Italy, may still become involved in it and the United States alone is safe and free to think and work for peace.

This war has come because the remedies offered by the physicians of peace and justice had been refused and the quack nostrums of the militarists had been swallowed, not only by the monarchs, but by gullible taxpayers. The chief cause for hope is that no people wanted this war and had there been time for the great forces of sanity to mobilize, war would have been prevented. The millions who are slaying each other and destroying the best that humanity has achieved were entrapped, every voter as helpless as a nonvoter, and all opposition silenced by lies, bewilderment and haste. Failure to create proper political machinery that could express the people's will is responsible for this unspeakable catastrophe. In this crisis, America and the neutral nations have a great task to perform in proffering mediation and in proposing terms of permanent peace. Public opinion had never such an opportunity to save humanity from a system which, if continued, will lead to more militarism and the decay of civilization.

The study of world peace now becomes the paramount duty of every man and woman who can read and think. The twisted logic and confused thinking, the alliances, balance of power and secret diplomacy which have driven millions of rational beings, with no quarrel with each other, into this senseless conflict must be examined as they never were before. Two new organizations formed within a year give hope of great usefulness in the campaign of peace education which now becomes imperative; these are the Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and the Woman's Peace Party, 116 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

All references to war in the following pages are to international war, not to rebellions or revolutions within a country. The two are in different categories. The order of lessons may be varied, and the whole amplified or condensed for various purposes. In order to maintain interest, classes should meet at least twice a month. Doubtless every town library, if asked, will secure the reference books required for the course. When not otherwise stated, books and pamphlets referred to may be had on application to the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston. *Single copies of pamphlets referred to and published by it, including this "Outline," sent free on application.*

OUTLINE OF LESSONS ON WAR AND PEACE.

LESSON I.

THE NATURE OF WAR.

1. **War is the deliberate, organized killing of one body of human beings by another body of human beings.** Clear definition very essential. Vast confusion and dangerous inferences from frequent confounding of different kinds of war and war with other forms of contests; the word often used in different meanings in the same sentence. Animals fight without deliberation, not in herd or pack, and rarely *kill their own kind*. Cobras do not *en masse* fight other cobras, nor tigers unite to slay tigers. Men the anomaly in the animal world in deliberately joining to destroy their own kind. War is less brutal than fiendish; love of it is not so instinctive in man as lusts and appetites or fisticuffs.

2. **War saps the virility** of a people, killing the most fit and leaving the least fit to beget posterity. Unlike contests against environment,—hunger, disease, ignorance, etc.,—war injures and degrades man. A few once self-indulgent men may gain fortitude by it, but the race is weakened. Compare Canadians with Venezuelans, the peaceful with constant fighters. Virility of Chinese, the only ancient people which survive; they always esteemed the scholar more than the soldier.

3. **Decline of war:** once the trade of every man. Except for getting game, primitive woman supported the family. Once there was a Hundred Years' War, a Thirty Years' War, a Seven Years' War. Umpired athletic contests are now replacing among youth the school fights of two generations ago. Like religious persecution, the witchcraft delusion, slavery, all abolished within two hundred years, war will end hundreds of years before murder, riots, intemperance, lust, corruption disappear, and a thousand years before prospects of the "Millennium."

4. **Four kinds of war:** sharply discriminate between them; each in different category.

Past war: killing in hand-to-hand fights; living on enemy's flocks and herds; at later stage, hired soldiers; no war loans saddling debts on posterity; no sanitation, nurses nor protection of non-combatants; neutral nations not much affected; no possibility of world organization nor easy preventives of war until recently.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

Future war: projectiles thrown below horizon at invisible foes from a battleship that costs wages of 5,000 men for one year; generals directing troops from the rear by wireless; non-combatants not killed, but cruelly taxed; huge war loans; possibly war in the air; inventions making our present costly armaments useless; neutral nations suffer greatly; in the Balkan War they lost hundreds of millions of dollars in commerce.

Civil war: essentially impromptu, long preparations impossible; may occur after international war ends; as difficult for a World Court to suppress civil war as for our Supreme Court to prevent riots within a state. Future civil war may be prevented or settled by mediation of neighbor nations. Overthrow of tyrants or suppressing rebellion a pardonable excuse for one side in some past civil wars.

International war: sometimes inevitable in the past under given conditions; never pardonable in the future, as ample substitutes are available and conditions changed,—this to be explained later.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. How does war differ from massacre? dueling? riot? animal contests? and from wholesome struggle against environment?
2. How many years and when has our republic fought with other nations?
3. Why were there fewer wars in the world in the 19th century than in the 18th?
4. How war reverses the principles of stock-breeding and leaves the unfit to propagate. See Jordan's "The Blood of the Nation"; also Norman Angell's "The Great Illusion," Part II, Chapter IV.
5. Show fallacy of Admiral Mahan's statement, "All force is, by degree, war." See "Swords and Ploughshares," pp. 92, 93; fallacy that Jesus sanctioned war by driving out the money-changers.
6. What kind of a war was our Revolutionary War? civil or international? Discuss other revolutions and their results.
7. Graphic pictures of war. See "Lay down your Arms," Baroness von Suttner; "The Downfall," Zola; "The Human Slaughter-House," Lazarus; "Pride of War," Janson,—a powerful narrative of the war in Tripoli. Article in *McClure's Magazine* by Frederick Palmer, September, 1913, on "The Most Up-to-Date Business—War."

LESSON II.

COMMON FALLACIES ABOUT WAR AND PEACE.

1. **That rival armies and navies are national police.** Dangerous vie 7, but held by millions of Christians, who in consequence vote for huge armaments and assume that we shall have "the army and navy forever." Police and militia will always be needed; their function totally different from rival navies and all large armies. Our small army

sometimes used as police in time of earthquake, flood, forest-fire or riot. Police function is primarily to preserve property, save life, do kindly protective work; police must use minimum of force when arresting, simply enough to put on handcuffs and convey criminals to court. Navies are ordered to use maximum of force; they exist to destroy and never convey to international court. Police exist to secure justice and not to fight other police. Navies and great armies have nothing to do with obtaining impartial justice, but are created to be ready to fight each other, though occasionally doing police duty. Function of police Ex-President Eliot places far higher than that of soldier. Illustrate and amplify this.

Militia functions are essentially different from army's in war. Militia is forbidden to shoot a fleeing mob after the riot act is read; they never fight the militia of another state; often perform police functions; but rival armies and navies are tools of governments which prepare for international dueling. Rival navies and armies must gradually be reduced and used for peaceful public service and for an International Police. Nations acting in concert will control such police and so maintain justice. See "The New Peace Movement," pp. 82–94.

2. **That government is based on physical force.** All governments use physical force, but none is chiefly based on it. The most stable government, like our own, rests on the will of the people. The most unstable, like Russia's or Turkey's, rests far more on force; yet even these two depend far more on money, agriculture, commerce, inventions and trained leaders than on armies and navies. No force possible unless soldiers are fed and paid. Our government rests besides on police, courts, schools, the press and the respect of other nations. For most of the last century we had a very small navy, yet were respected, and we have never been attacked by an outside power since the Revolution.

3. **That human nature must change before war can end.** The same thing once said about slavery. Human nature has changed in the last century by creation of conditions which leave much innate deviltry dormant and give outlet to innate love of contest in struggle against environment. Contrast conditions one hundred years ago with those now as regards insane, children, women, wounded in war, slaves, cruelty, proportion who voted, achievements of missionaries among cannibals, intemperance, a sense of democracy and brotherhood of man. Though human nature changes, federation or union of small political units has done as much for peace as even change of human nature.

4. **"In time of peace prepare for war,"** a maxim hundreds of years old. Any value it ever had has passed. Our century should substitute "In time of peace prepare for peace," despite the constant

claim that preparedness for war insures peace. Preparations for war are becoming more costly in the long run than modern war itself. The supposed remedy for war must now be counted almost as bad as the disease. See pamphlet on "The Drain of Armaments."*

5. **That questions of vital interest and national honor should not be arbitrated.** Individuals constantly arbitrate such since dueling ceased. That "Uncle Sam will never arbitrate a slap in the face" is cheap and heathenish talk. Uncle Sam has had no "slap" for a century, if indeed ever. Alternative to peaceful settlement is killing thousands of innocent soldiers to avenge an "insult" from government officials who never fight.

6. **That compulsory military training is good for all youths.** It has some advantages, with many disadvantages. The former could be had by strict, systematic work under government requirement for those unable to pass certain physical and educational tests. Physical drill, lessons in hygiene, life-saving, etc., practical service of country in planting forests, etc., could replace study of art of killing. French and German youths from 17 to 19 much better off if drafted for this instead of being compelled as now to leave field, shop and factory for two or three years for military service from 19 to 22 years of age.

7. **That our armaments are a national "insurance."** Our military charges in the last 30 years equal $4,000,000,000; this is 13 times cost of the Spanish War. If armaments "insure," we paid a premium 13 times greater than the loss, plus the loss itself!

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Is there historic ground for belief that "conquer we must when our cause it is just"? Why did we conquer in the Mexican War, which General Grant called one of the most unjust wars ever fought by a strong people against a weak one?
2. Can both sides, however sincere, be equally right? Was there ever a war more than fifty per cent. just? Mention wars in which neither side had just claim.
3. Point out fallacy in "Will war end with this century? Not unless injustice ends." (Lyman Abbott.)
4. When and how did dueling end in English-speaking countries? Where is it still recognized?
5. In what exceptional instances has our navy been used for real police functions?
6. Why do Great Britain, Germany and Italy have no wars now within their borders as they had constantly centuries ago? Is their human nature essentially different from that in the days of Chaucer, Luther or Dante?
7. The navy as "insurance." See "Swords and Ploughshares," Chapter V.
8. Mention other common fallacies, and discuss them.

** Note in each lesson that pamphlets referred to are sent free on application to the World Peace Foundation, No. 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston.*

LESSON III.

NATIONAL DANGERS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE.

1. **Kind and amount of defense needed do not depend on national wealth, coast line nor population,** as the militarists claim. Modern wealth, unlike ancient wealth, cannot be carried off; it depends largely on business confidence; is largely affected when foreign customers suffer. Wealthy nations can buy munitions of war quicker than poor nations. Since second Hague Conference of 1907, no undefended place can be bombarded. Our whole coast is protected by this provision or by fortification of cities. Our length of coast line is no criterion for number of battleships. Our population is less than 25 times what it was in Washington's day, yet our expense for army and navy has increased over 250 times since then. China with a population ten times that of France does not need ten times as great a navy.

2. **Sole criterion of amount and kind of nation's defense is amount and kind of danger.** The United States has no danger from without, but great dangers from within. *In its three foreign wars combined it lost less than* 15,000 *men by foreign bullets. It began all its three foreign wars.* It has had 100 or more years of peace with every nation on earth save Spain and Mexico. Neither of these attacked us. Minister Woodford declared afterward that the war with Spain would have been prevented, had we waited 48 hours. All the good we did Cuba could have been gained by securing a long truce and a wise expenditure of a tithe of what we did spend. See "Swords and Ploughshares," pp. 84–86. If no nation attacked us when we were weak, with slight commerce, and there were few substitutes for war, none will attack us now that the Hague Court has made war avoidable and our commerce and banking render us a vital factor in other nations' prosperity. Japan has no designs on us nor on the Philippines. Her interests and attention are now in manufactures and commerce, in national improvements, on holding and developing Formosa and Korea, with its millions of discontented people, and on developing Manchuria. Should she try to seize the Philippines, she must divide her forces and keep half at home to guard her new possessions, or Russia and China might encroach. We have taught her people. They are grateful and friendly. Malice, race prejudice and false suspicions fostered by those who would find excuse for building more battleships regularly create a war panic before annual vote on appropriations. Said Justice Brewer, "There are 727 active and retired officers in Washington who are making of our national capital a military center."

The man who wants contracts for armaments or will receive more glory and prestige by them is as incompetent to judge dangers and defense impartially as a judge who should try a case in which his family or income is concerned. Men whose work is technical, dealing with engineering, target-shooting, etc., the last to understand the questions of psychology, economics, history and statesmanship which affect security or danger.

3. **Internal dangers** threaten us more than do those of most great nations. We shamefully exceed them in homicides, needless accidents and lynchings. 600,000 *persons—forty per cent. of all who die—perish needlessly in our country every year.* Consider this in detail as regards tuberculosis, fire, mining, accidents, etc. The National Children's Bureau has less income than the cost of annual repairs on two torpedo-boat destroyers! Our National Bureau of Education is in sore need. Defense against child labor, vice, poverty, ignorance, etc., suffers because of our artificial panics and silly fears about nations with which we have kept the peace since the republic began. We put our chief defense where it is least needed, and our least defense where most needed.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. What dangers have Germany and Japan that we have not?
2. "The Truth about Japan,"—see pamphlet with that title.
3. War-scares about Japan. See Jordan's "Unseen Empire," pp. 111, 122.
4. What evidences are there of the Kaiser's friendliness to the United States? Could Germany gain anything by injuring us?
5. National dangers. See Chapter II, "Swords and Ploughshares," also the World Almanac and Jordan's "Unseen Empire," pp. 158–167.
6. Why do we not dread the greatest naval power on earth?
7. How does the space devoted in our newspapers to war games and maneuvers and military news compare with the same in the period before the Spanish War?

LESSON IV.

THE MODERN WAR SYSTEM AND ITS COST.

1. **Preparation for war.** This preparation, in the words of Czar's rescript of 1908, "is bringing about the very cataclysm it is designed to avert." Conscription with recent increase in all Europe except Great Britain. Millions of non-producers, including volunteers in other lands, fed, clothed, equipped with costly weapons. Vast numbers drawn from constructive work to prepare short-lived, destructive weapons. Millions of European women in consequence drawing loads or digging

fields, doing men's outdoor work. Strenuous efforts being made in England to get conscription adopted and in the United States to have an enormous trained reserve force.

2. **Cost.** All told, for the world's annual war preparations over two and a quarter billion dollars; equals $2.25 spent every minute during Christian era, or a pile of dollar bills piled like leaves in a book 116 miles high! Loss of earnings of non-productive soldiers doubles this. The United States has spent for all purposes during its history $21,500,000,000. Of this, $16,000,000,000 was spent on war and its incidents. Ponder these startling facts; learn them by heart; pass them along.

3. **War loans:** a modern invention, placing burdens on fourth generation of posterity even if war ceased to-day! See Jordan's "Unseen Empire," pp. 23–51.

4. **Competition in armaments.** Each nation naïvely asserts it arms "simply for defense"; that security demands its own armaments must exceed its neighbor's. A must outrank B, and B must outrank A! England's theory that its navy must equal any two-power equipment (the United States excepted). Result: steady increase in inventions for war; in other inventions to counteract the first, *e.g.*, torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers; still more to counteract the second invention, etc.; focusing inventive thought on destructive work, withdrawing it from constructive; alarming increase in debts and cost of living, but no increased security.

5. **Capturing private property at sea still legalized in war,**—though nations are bound to leave private property of an enemy immune on land, it is not yet immune at sea,—a potent cause of increased fleets to protect ocean commerce. The United States has always opposed this.

6. **War-scares** chiefly due to (1) commercialized press influenced by desire to sell exciting news, and by pressure from certain vested interests; relation of the Krupp firm and other contractors to war-scares; (2) pressure from government employees who want continuance in same kind of jobs connected with war supplies; (3) militarists who have focused their minds for decades on war and are blind to its new substitutes; (4) an uninformed public, impressed by "war games" and naval parades, easily gullible by war rumors.

7. **Comparative expenditures.** The total annual income for the peace cause in the whole world equals less than the cost of one single torpedo-boat destroyer!

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. What does the United States spend annually for pensions? Compare this with the expense in earlier years. See World Almanac.
2. Is a national debt a blessing? See "The Unseen Empire," pp. 56–59.
3. Armament syndicates and war-scares. The Krupp revelations. *Ibid.*, pp. 102-125.

4. How would Great Britain's yielding to the request in 1907 of the United States and Germany to protect private property at sea in time of war reduce demands for great navies and profoundly affect the whole war system? *Ibid.*, pp. 92–94.

5. How militarism largely accounts for increased cost of living. See report of Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living, 1910 (pamphlet made up from same published by the World Peace Foundation).

6. Estimate probable number employed in building one $15,000,000 battleship with number required to build 150 trade-schools at $100,000 each, which would last more than twenty times as long as a battleship could be used and would send forth generations of self-supporting citizens.

7. Discuss the fallacy in the statement that "manufacturing armaments gives employment and circulates money."

8. How can comparative statistics regarding peace and war be so treated as to affect the imagination and be made impressive?

LESSON V.

"THE GREAT ILLUSION."

1. An epoch-making book, translated into over twenty languages. Author, Ralph Norman Angell Lane (Norman Angell), English-born, a naturalized American, educated in France and Switzerland. His keen exposure of current fallacies startles business men and statesmen. This book has impressed the great statesmen of the world,—the German Kaiser, Sir Edward Grey and others. 10,000 copies of cheap edition sold in Germany in one week; 40,000 brochures containing gist of it sent to German students by Garton Foundation.

2. **Main points.** *a. Man's struggle must be against environment, not against man.* Co-operation of man with man hastens mastery over hostile nature and bad conditions. Science and business demand increasing co-operation. *b. Human nature constantly changes.* Fighting due to scarcity of game yielded to settled industry; tribal fights were ended by union and wider area in which peaceful pursuits could flourish; end of religious war; now only conflict of States survives. This is chiefly due to certain fallacies as to the relation of political and economic interests, even though a war is supposed to be incited by sentiment of honor, revenge, etc. Profound change in complex financial *interdependence of world capitals* in the last thirty years. *c. Conquest brings no profit* to-day with civilized rival nations in fully occupied territory, though it often brought material gain under by-gone conditions. Trade depends on natural wealth and people capable of working it; is carried on by checks and is based on credit and confidence. Trade could only be destroyed by destroying population. Annexation of conquered territory annexes competitors who still compete. "Enemies" are customers and investors.

d. Success in trade to-day has no relation to size of country or to its armaments. Norway with insignificant navy has per capita nearly three times the carrying trade of Great Britain. Safety of investments not increased by armaments. Belgium's 3 per cents quoted at 96, and Germany's at only 82. Russia's 3½ per cents quoted at 81, and Norway's at 102. "Defenseless" nations in less danger of war than are those armed to the teeth. *e. Force that secures greater co-operation between parts of the body politic marks advance.* The predominant factor is shifting from the physical to the intellectual plane. The farther one gets from physical force in acquiring wealth, the greater the result. The whole book should be carefully studied. See "The Great Illusion," Chapter V, Part II.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Sketch of Norman Angell's work and theories. See "Swords and Ploughshares," pp. 139–152.
2. Weakness of some pacifist arguments. See "The Great Illusion," Chap. II, pp. 7–14.
3. Axioms of modern statecraft. *Ibid.*, Chapter II.
4. What is the essence of the great illusion? *Ibid.*, Chap. III.
5. What would result from German invasion of England? from England's annexation of Hamburg? *Ibid.*, pp. 54–62.
6. German commerce and English credit. Why Switzerland can beat Great Britain in trade with Canada. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–71.

Why has public credit improved in South America? *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 75.

How destroying competitors destroys customers. *Ibid.*, pp. 78–84.

LESSON VI.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

13th to 18th Century. 600 years before the Hague Conference of 1899, Pierre Dubois, a pupil of St. Thomas Aquinas, presented a scheme for a permanent tribunal of arbitration similar to that accepted at The Hague. Henry IV of France with his great minister, Sully, worked out a scheme, published after their deaths, for a federation of European states. In 1624 a book by Emeric Crucé developed the thought of a regular system of arbitration. The next year Hugo Grotius published "The Rights of War and Peace," of which Andrew D. White has said, "Of all works not claiming to be inspired it has proved the greatest blessing to humanity."

In the same century George Fox founded the Society of Friends, whose tongues made others quake and caused them to be dubbed "Quakers."

The high-bred scholar and pioneer, William Penn, published in 1693 a plan for the "Present and Future Peace of Europe." The work of all these men before the 18th century was notable, but aside from that of Grotius and Fox had few practical results.

18th to 20th Century. In 1795 Immanuel Kant's tractate on "Eternal Peace" with profound insight proclaimed that war would never cease until the world was organized, and that it could never be organized until its constituent nations had achieved self-government. The 19th century at last extended the principles of democracy. At its beginning hardly a nation had real self-government, and communication was no faster than in the time of Moses. At its close nearly every nation had some form of self-government, while electricity, wireless telegraphy and steam bound the world together. For the first time in history, world organization is feasible, and it is necessary.

"The United States is the greatest peace society in the world." Free trade and peace between forty-eight states of very varying conditions and size presage the same between forty-eight nations. Our Supreme Court the forerunner of the World Court. It has always kept peace between one state and another; was never designed to prevent one-half the states trying to overthrow the national government. If, by analogy, one-half of the world fought the other half,—an unthinkable thing,—of course no Hague Court could settle such universal war. Supreme Court made peace easy; without it many interstate wars would have resulted. It cannot end crime within states, as a World Court cannot prevent civil war. When established, our Supreme Court was suspected, and it had no case for two years. The Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, of great international as well as national significance. Principle of federation exemplified in Swiss and Dutch federations, and on continental scale by United States.

First Peace Societies in the world founded in 1815,—in New York by David Low Dodge, and later the same year in Boston by Noah Worcester and William Ellery Channing. English Peace Society founded in 1816. A great work for peace accomplished by Charles Sumner in his "True Grandeur of Nations" and other orations, by William Ladd, by Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," by Richard Cobden, John Bright, Victor Hugo, Passy and others in Europe. Five wonderful International Peace Congresses, 1843–1851, in London, Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, and again in London. Great set-back to the cause by Crimean War, when England, as Lord Salisbury said years afterward, "put her money on the wrong horse." But the whole theory of arbitration was worked out; various cases were arbitrated by tribunals set up for the occasion, before this war. The idea of a Congress of Nations was known in Europe as the "American plan."

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Who was Hugo Grotius, and what did his great work accomplish?
2. What did George Fox and his followers preach?
3. Character and achievement of William Penn.
4. Of Immanuel Kant? Elihu Burritt?
5. Franklin, Washington and Jefferson on War. (See pamphlet with this title.)
6. What serious interstate differences has the United States Supreme Court settled?
7. How can the United States show the way to a United World?
8. The Monroe doctrine or British-American co-operation to protect weak South American republics from aggression. See "Right and Wrong of the Monroe Doctrine," by Charles F. Dole (pamphlet). Also Prof. Hiram Bingham's little book on "The Monroe Doctrine: An Obsolete Shibboleth."

LESSON VII.

THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES.

In August, 1898, the Czar issued a rescript proposing a Peace Conference to the 26 nations having ambassadors at his court,—20 European nations with the United States, Mexico, China, Japan, Siam and Persia. He sent a second rescript, January, 1899, containing program. His first thought was to call the conference merely for limitation of armaments: his second rescript offered wider scope. 100 representatives with 50 attachés met on May 18, 1899, in the "House in the Woods" at The Hague, most of them as skeptical of success as were delegates to our Constitutional Convention in 1787. Andrew D. White, our ambassador to Germany, headed the American delegation. He, Lord Pauncefote, Bourgeois of France and a few others of courage and foresight inspired remainder. French language used. President, Baron de Staal (Russia); each country had one vote; members divided into 3 committees: on Armaments, Laws and Customs of Warfare, Arbitration and other means of preventing war. Secret sessions; no stenographic reports. In the midst of proceedings, Germany's indifference largely removed by American effort. For valuable and graphic details of Conference see "Memoirs of Baroness von Suttner," vol. ii, and Andrew D. White's "The First Hague Conference."

Three great results of less than three months' work:—

a. Commissions of Inquiry.

b. Mediation.

c. Provision for Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration to which all nations might send cases; this optional. No permanent judges, but each nation appoints four competent judges, who form a panel now numbering 176. When a case is tried, the disputing states select three

or five judges from this panel by a method acceptable to both. Ratification of the conventions by respective governments delayed establishment of Tribunal until April, 1901.

First case submitted to Hague Court by United States and Mexico. A dozen cases have now been submitted, some preventing war. The Interparliamentary Union in 1904, after its Conference in St. Louis, asked President Roosevelt to call Second Hague Conference. He issued preliminary notes, but Conference was delayed until 1907, owing to Russo-Japanese War and Pan-American Conference. To second Hague Conference 47 nations were invited, the Czar asking privilege of issuing invitations. 44 nations attended, representing more than 96 per cent. of world's population. Conference met in ancient "Hall of the Knights," at The Hague, 256 delegates, 1 to 15 per country. Each country, 1 vote; delegates seated alphabetically. President, Nelidov (Russia); plenary sessions open by tickets to public. Conference sat from June 15 to Oct. 15, 1907. Divided into 4 commissions. Conventions signed provided for International Prize Court, proposed by Germany; prohibition of bombardment of undefended places; for the practical prohibition of war to collect contractual debts; and for various limitations of the field of war. So long as war remains legalized, the lessening of its cruelties and area is of highest importance. Recommendations made for appointment of judges for a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice, study of limitation of armaments, that balloons shall not be used for throwing explosives, etc. Corner-stone laid of Palace of Peace, gift of Andrew Carnegie costing $1,500,000, given at suggestion of Andrew D. White; this opened August, 1913.

This Conference provided for a third, and this means regular series hereafter; decisive step in World Organization, the most far-reaching political achievement in history: the machinery for peace between nations is being evolved; study of it is the duty of every patriot and servant of the Prince of Peace.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Jean de Bloch, his "Future of War" and help to the first Hague Conference. See introduction and preface to "Future of War" (abridged translation), or briefer account, pp. 136–139, "Swords and Ploughshares."

2. How did Commission of Inquiry prevent war between England and Russia? See Dogger Bank story in Dr. Tryon's pamphlet, "The Hague Peace System in Operation," or, in brief, "Swords and Ploughshares," p. 17.

3. How mediation ended war between Russia and Japan at Kittery navy-yard.

4. Czar's manifesto and results of second Hague Conference. See pp. 236–240, *Ibid.* The results of the two Hague Conferences and the demands upon the third Conference (pamphlet). For full account of both Conferences see Professor Hull's "Two Hague Conferences."

5. Who are our judges on the Hague Tribunal?

LESSON VIII.

ARBITRATION AND A WORLD CONGRESS.

1. **Arbitrators are umpires** chosen by parties to a quarrel to settle controversies according to best judgment, not, like a judge, according to prescribed law; often ignore technicalities and make concessions as judge cannot. Arbitration often used now by contestants in settling cases out of court. Settlement of interstate controversies by United States Supreme Court marked great advance not only in preventing war between our 48 states, but as showing way to peace between nations.

2. **History of international arbitration.** Rarely used in the ancient world. Arbitration clause put by Jay in 1794 into our treaty with England. From 1814 to 1840 only 24 settlements in the world by arbitration or special commission; 1901–1904, 63; over 150 arbitration treaties signed since, usually for 5-year period.

3. **Good faith.** Most impressive to note that no nation that gave its case to arbitration has ever refused to abide by award and gone to war; 350 international disputes in the world peacefully settled; in one instance, after arbitration a compromise; in another, mediation followed arbitration.

4. **Court of Arbitral Justice,** to interpret international law, needed to supplement Arbitration Tribunal at The Hague. Nations can then choose which they will resort to; each has advantages. This Court already agreed to in 1907 at Hague Conference, but as not all nations could be represented on the board of judges, which ought not to exceed 15 members, no plan yet arrived at.

5. The United States has led the world in arbitration, being a party to more than 100 arbitrations. But in 1897 a general treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain was defeated by three senators whose combined constituents equalled less than population of Chicago. A two-thirds vote of Senate necessary for ratification of treaties. Again, in 1912, the will of the majority of our citizens and of the governments of England and France was defeated by one or two senators whose votes prevented ratification of President Taft's treaties providing peaceful settlement of all future difficulties between us and those countries. Defeat due partly to "playing politics" before Presidential election. Bitter disappointment to the world, as other nations would have followed example we set. 30,000 sermons preached in American churches and wide-spread discussion in behalf of these treaties.

6. **World Congress.** The Hague Conferences will probably eventually develop into a World Parliament with delegated powers. This

would labor for a universal coinage, better quarantine, uniform standards of weights and measures, free trade, etc., and deal with ever new international problems. *Executive commissions* to execute decisions of Congress.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Story of the arbitration between Argentina and Chile, and of the Christ of the Andes.
2. Should future World Congress, like our national Congress, have two houses, one representing governments, the other based on populations? See "The New Peace Movement," pp. 48, 49.
3. Arbitration *vs.* armaments. See *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII.
4. Apologists for war. See *Ibid.*, Chapter X.
5. The Geneva award settling "Alabama" claims involving vital interests and honor.
6. The Venezuelan arbitration of 1896, and the war-scare in the United States preceding it.
7. Growth of industrial arbitration.

LESSON IX.

VARIOUS WAYS OF PREVENTING WAR.

METHODS.

1. **Diplomacy and mediation,** *e.g.*, our own between Russia and Japan.

2. **Investigation.** The plan advocated by Secretary of State Bryan and others, "that all disputes between nations of every nature whatsoever which diplomacy shall fail to adjust shall be submitted for investigation and report to an international commission, and that the nations shall agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and report." Twenty-nine nations before Nov. 1, adhered to this proposal, including the great powers, the first treaty being signed with Salvador. The majority of the Senate favored this procedure, while the Taft arbitration treaties with Great Britain and France failed by a few votes of getting the necessary two-thirds majority enabling the President to ratify. The Bryan plan was accepted by the Senate in executive session before submission to foreign states. Its method is a development of the Commission of Inquiry provided by the Hague Convention.

3. **Neutralization.** Process of conferring inviolability by belligerents. Applied to weak countries, *e.g.*, possibly to the Philippines when given independence; this would secure by treaty between the United States

and all possibly aggressive nations their future safety from aggression or annexation. Switzerland, Belgium, the islands of Corfu and Paxos, Luxemburg, the territorial basin of the Congo, and Cyprus are neutralized by agreement of the powers. The Suez Canal is neutralized, and the word is used with reference to the Panama Canal. The principle is applied on our Canadian border-line. Though a single nation may play the brigand, as Italy did with Tripoli, it would not easily ignore a pledge made to a group of nations to "keep hands off."

4. **Peace budget.** Every civilized nation should have a peace budget. One dollar in every $1,000 spent for army and navy would give in the United States over $280,000 a year for peace. Estimate how many statesmen, editors and scientists could interchange visits when friction threatened, and how much accurate official information might prevent misunderstanding and mistakes if this were secured by wise use of that sum. Several nations contribute to the International Peace Bureau at Berne, and England allows about $80,000 annually for a peace budget.

5. **Prohibition of war loans** to any nation that refuses investigation or arbitration a great deterrent of war. No Christian nation should tolerate loans by neutrals to belligerents. Richard Cobden, Oscar Straus, James Speyer and others have powerfully opposed them. Great powers coerce Turkey by this method.

6. **Non-intercourse** a powerful agent strongly advocated by Justice Brewer and others to compel or punish stubborn nations; is the political expression of the Christian injunction. This, when eventually incorporated into treaties as penalty for breaking faith, would enable a group of nations to coerce another into good behavior without shedding blood. The mere threat of withdrawing diplomatic, postal and, as a last resort, commercial relations would be sufficient if made by a group of nations. See pp. 115–118, "Swords and Ploughshares."

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. History and significance of neutralization. See pamphlet on "Neutralization: America's Opportunity."

2. Which is better, neutralization or fortification of Panama Canal? See *Ibid.*

3. The Philippine problem: how would neutralization affect capitalists scheming to exploit the islands? How affect the size of our navy needed in the Pacific? What have we as a nation gained by holding the Philippines instead of neutralizing them? Would neutralization prevent their employing advisers and teachers as China and Japan have done or provision securing protection of foreigners? See "Swords and Ploughshares," Chapter VIII.

4. How have Chinese in last few years by boycott on American goods forced amelioration of conditions? by boycott of Japanese goods brought Japan to terms? Burmese boycotts of English goods. Note distinction between sporadic boycotts, often unjust, and the legalized penalty suggested for breaking faith with several nations.

5. Why diplomacy and settling questions out of court will increase as World Court is established.

LESSON X.

PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALISM.

The right patriotism consists in the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity.—EMERSON.

1. **Patriotism means loyalty to the ideals of one's native land;** does not imply support of current national policies, right or wrong. The words,

> "I could not love thee, dear, so much,
> Loved I not honor more,"

apply to country as well as to a sweetheart. Patriots acknowledge national errors as a gentleman does personal errors.

2. **Test of patriotism,** like test of religion, is service. Patriotism often confounded with pride of ancestry, love of colonial relics, martial music and bunting,—all harmless, but involving no sacrifice. The service now most needed is to fight real foes instead of to prepare further for hypothetical ones. Colonel Waring lowering New York's annual death-list by 15,000 lives by removing filth; all civic service which helps save the 600,000 lives needlessly wasted annually or helps make our country nobler is the highest patriotic service.

3. **Patriotism often mistaught** in the schools; children, often unconscious bigots, positive their own country is always best and right. Teach that the Revolution was fought between progressives and retrogressives on both sides of the Atlantic. Show what Pitt, Burke, Fox and others did for our cause; that English text-books honor Washington as much as ours do.

4. **National anthems** should be of broad and noble scope, not apply merely to one set of citizens, like soldiers. Tune of "America" used by British, Germans and Swiss as well as by us. "Star-spangled Banner" air taken from an old English drinking-song; this song sometimes groundlessly assigned pre-eminence as being "American."

5. **Humanity.** As loyalty to family does not lessen loyalty to country, so patriotism should not lessen love of humanity. We are human beings before we are members of any race or country.

6. **Interdependence of nations** due to science, rapid communication, international regulations affecting postal relations, wireless telegraph, railroads, maritime, literary and industrial property, etc., investments in foreign lands and wholesale emigration, is transforming the world. "La Vie Internationale" in 2,650 marvelous pages records 500 present international organizations. 10,000 physicians from every land met in 1913 in London. Similar international bodies of engineers,

chemists, teachers, manufacturers, etc., meet regularly to discuss common problems. The chemist or artist from Brazil has often more in common with one from Japan or Denmark than with his banker at home.

7. **The Interparliamentary Union,** founded in 1889 by William Randal Cremer of the British Parliament, composed of 2,500 members of parliaments, organized to meet regularly and discuss international problems. Secretary of American group, S. N. D. North, Carnegie Endowment, Washington. International headquarters, Brussels.

8. **The Pan American Union,** the outcome of international Conferences with Latin-American republics, headquarters Washington, is a powerful bond of union, Hon. John Barrett, director; publishes a valuable monthly magazine in English, French, Portuguese and Spanish. Our great ignorance about and small trade with South America will soon be changed.

9. **The International Institute of Agriculture,** supported by 47 nations bound by treaty, has experts from all these countries constantly working at its headquarters in Rome, cabling simultaneously to the world's stock markets reports of crops, preventing "corners" in wheat, cotton, etc., promoting rural credits, studying insect pests, etc. It is a silent, powerful force for internationalism. Founded by the King of Italy, at initiative of David Lubin, of California; opened 1908. See pp. 48–55, "Swords and Ploughshares." All the above organizations are powerful agencies for peace.

10. **Better manners** by tourists, consuls and drummers, special courtesy to foreign-born college students, more imagination in putting one's self in another's place, and willingness to learn would powerfully help promote the new internationalism. Emphasize Garrison's motto, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind"; Goldwin Smith's words, "Above all nations is humanity"; Terence's line, "I count nothing human foreign to me."

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Are Americans, as a whole, patriotic?
2. How can "Patriotic" Societies best promote patriotism?
3. Is there any danger of patriotic symbols becoming a fetish, as religious symbols so often have been?
4. Mention twenty persons who have best served the United States.
5. Songs best suited for national anthems. See pp. 178–183, "Swords and Ploughshares."
6. How can patriotism be increased? Is it promoted by schools saluting the flag daily? See "The New Peace Movement," Chapter XIII.
7. Why is there much discontent in South American republics with our republic? How prevent it? Apply to Pan American Union; also to World Peace Foundation for paper on "The United States and South America."
8. How disarmament along Canadian frontier since the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817 has promoted friendship between Great Britain and the United States.

LESSON XI.

EDUCATION AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

Universal education of humanity not necessary prerequisite for world peace. Specific education in international issues in six or eight great nations will achieve it for the world if public sentiment in these nations is active. Indirect education of home, school and play the most effective. Toys, table-talk, pictures, songs may promote contempt for aliens or interest in them, prejudice or justice, war or peace. Give every child stories and pictures of his little "cousins" in every land.

The American School Peace League* the best-organized body in the world for promoting in the schools the movement to replace war by law. An outcome of the First National Peace Congress in 1907 and organized in 1908; affiliated with the World Peace Foundation and the National Education Association; has branches in 40 states; is supported by leading educators of the country; is composed of teachers, normal students and those specially interested in education; no dues from teachers or students, but appeals for sustaining members. It needs income of $50,000 a year to reach our half million teachers.

The National Bureau of Education annually issues free over 12,000 pamphlets prepared by the League's secretary for peace exercises in schools on May 18; 60,000 more bought by teachers; translated into other languages. The League will issue in 1914 an important volume for teachers with material for a course in Good Citizenship. This is on a pedagogic basis, showing application of principles of justice, sympathy, loyalty in the playground, home, school, city, state, nation and family of nations; the course graded from primary schools to high schools, the earlier lessons enforced by stories and pictures, in older classes the lessons correlated with studies in history, literature, geography and civics. Norman Angell preparing text-book on civics for secondary schools, laying basis for a true internationalism.

A British School Peace League followed the American; similar leagues planned for every country; plan for an International Council composed of two eminent educators from each country, with heads of departments on standardization of history, teaching, the press; interchange of lectures and students, etc. The action of the Dutch Government in holding the International Education Conference at The Hague in September, 1914, came from initiative of the League. Apply to Commissioner Philander P. Claxton, National Bureau of Education, Washington, for information.

*Superintendent Randall J. Condon of Cincinnati, president; Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston, secretary.

The Cosmopolitan Clubs in 30 colleges and universities (movement begun in 1903) include as many nationalities and over 2,000 students; are affiliated with the International Federation of Students "Corda Fratres," and are a powerful agency to promote international understanding. Similar clubs known under different titles recently established in leading European universities through the initiative of George W. Nasmyth, Ph.D., of Cornell, head of Student Department of the World Peace Foundation. In England and Scotland are many young men in War and Peace Clubs and International Polity Clubs to study international economic relations. German students are offered prizes for the best essays on Norman Angell's writings. International Students' Congresses.

The Intercollegiate Peace Association. Dr. Thwing, of Western Reserve University, president; Prof. S. F. Weston, of Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, secretary. Holds intercollegiate and interstate oratorical contests for prizes. About 80 colleges compete. Only lack of funds prevents extending organization to 500 colleges. $2,000 given annually in prizes.

The Christian Students' Federation has nearly 2,500 associations, about 160,000 members, and, with John R. Mott as its able and inspiring leader, is a powerful agency for peace.

Cecil Rhodes scholarships, Kahn traveling scholarships, interchange of professors between Berlin and Harvard and Columbia universities, Harvard and the Sorbonne, Harvard and Japan, the Association Concordia of Japan, the Japan Society and other similar organizations in this country, and especially the Association for International Conciliation, promote good understanding among educated classes.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. What prizes are offered by the School Peace League?
2. Topics issued by History Committee of the League connecting history with peace movement. Apply to secretary, and pass on to the teachers in your town.
3. "Internationalism among Universities." See Louis P. Lochner's pamphlet with this title.
4. Intercollegiate Oratorical Peace Contests. See Reports of Mohonk Conferences, 1912, 1913.
5. International Christian Students' Association. Headquarters, 124 East 28th Street, New York City. Apply for reports.
6. How to interest young people in the peace movement, see "The Friendship of Nations," illustrated, by Lucile Gulliver; written for children of 10 to 16 years. How can we lend color, music, pageantry to the peace movement and emphasize its virility? Chicago peace pageant of 1,200 school children in May, 1913, arranged by one teacher.

LESSON XII.

THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR.

1. **The clergy** usually support war when waged by their own country. Only one English bishop distinctly opposed Boer War. With many noble exceptions, spirit of Joshua rather than Jesus has ruled. A marked interest in arbitration now appears in pulpit. Federation of Churches stands strongly for peace, yet another war might bring out the same old sophistries among some about "battling for the Lord," "holy war," and Scriptural phrases wrested from their context; *e.g.*, "I come not to bring peace, but a sword," etc. If the spirit of early Christians had survived in Church, war would have ended in all Christian lands long ago. The Church should lead in the war against war, as such clergymen as Dr. Charles E. Jefferson of New York, and Dean Charles R. Brown of the Yale Theological School, Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago, Rev. Charles F. Dole of Boston, and many like them are notably doing to-day.

2. **The citizen** in war time persecuted and traduced if he dares to differ with government policy; freedom of speech practically prohibited. Even in Philippine and Boer Wars, which were remote and not vital to life of stronger nations, many of the most patriotic citizens ostracized and injured. All sense of justice lost. Cobden and Bright burnt in effigy for opposing Crimean War.

3. **Journalist.** The modern press with its cartoons often deadlier than the sword. Aiming chiefly at large circulation, editors often controlled by owners of paper and compelled in war time to publish what is expedient for owners' interests. Courage needed as much in editorial sanctum as on battlefields. Mention strong American organs of international friendship and justice. Importance of reading at least two journals of opposite policies. Press censor may detain or alter war correspondents' reports. Little certainty of getting truth in war time. The other side rarely presented.

4. **Trader,** usually ignorant of modern economics, imagines gain in conquest. Poor Asiatics supposed to be better customers for us than our own negroes and poor whites and South Americans. If one-third of annual naval budget were spent on educating the latter to new wants and ability to purchase, a thousand times more trade would be won than by over-sea possessions. Italy's folly in expecting to gain by ownership of Tripoli. See Jordan's "Unseen Empire," pp. 72–74. France has lost more than she has gained by African possessions except for a bigger place on the map. Commercial world controls government policies. True economics consistent with ethics. "Nothing permanent is gained by brute force," said Napoleon at St. Helena.

5. **Politician.** Governmental secrecy necessary in war. Public helpless and mystified. War is a confession of political failure. Politician tempted to let soldiers atone for his blunders or insults; to discount the future with war loans; to neglect internal improvements; to yield to lobbyists for selfish contractors; to sanction falsehood and deceit. See "Moral Damage of War," Chapter V.

6. **Soldier.** Blind obedience required, with reason suspended, tends to become callous to profanity, cruelty, licentiousness. See *ibid.*, Chapter IV. Secretary Stimson confessed that American soldiers ranked worse than any others in prevalence of vile diseases. Illustrate degeneration of "Christian" soldiers in Balkan War to level of Turks and below wild beasts.

7. **Reformer.** War means postponement of all internal reforms; all charities starved; internal corruption goes unnoticed. Enormous setback of democracy and social reform in Great Britain from Boer War; killing brown men led to increased hardships to black men after Philippine War; North and South, united as brothers in this blunder in the East, made Southern views on color prevail; condition of negro in North harder than before war.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Difficulties of clergy in preaching peace. See p. 265, Walsh's "Moral Damage of War." How did the Church in Italy view the Tripoli War?
2. Why does Imperialism tend to reliance on militarism, and democracy to reliance on law? Draw illustrations from history and present conditions. *Ibid.*, Chapter XI.
3. Attitude of politicians, public and soldiers in time of war agitation. See pp. 67–78, pp. 123–126, "Swords and Ploughshares."
4. Is race prejudice with children instinctive or acquired?
5. How can we develop imagination and sympathy? the power to put one's self in another's place?
6. Attitude of the early Church on war. See Carnegie's Rectorial Address (pamphlet).
7. Moral damage from conscription and effect of war on the home.

LESSON XIII.

NEW PEACE AGENCIES.

1. **International Peace Bureau at Berne, Switzerland,** is the central agency for the peace societies of the world. President, Senator La Fontaine of Belgium, with members from various countries. It arranges the International Peace Congresses; publishes the monthly *Peace Movement* in French, German and English; carries on investigations, etc.

2. **The Interparliamentary Union** established in 1889 by William Randal Cremer, M.P.; meets annually in the different capitals; composed of members of parliaments past and present; discusses

international problems. 2,500 members. Secretary, Dr. Christian L. Lange, Brussels, Belgium. It has accomplished much and has great possibilities of influence.

3. **Association for International Conciliation** founded by Baron D'Estournelles de Constant. President Butler the head of American branch; several branches in other countries; apply to F. P. Keppel, secretary, Sub-station 84, New York City, to be put on list of names for its valuable free pamphlets.

4. **The Nobel Peace prize** of about $40,000 given annually by committee of the Norwegian Parliament since 1901; rewards conspicuous workers for peace, either individuals or societies.

5. **The Leagues for Promoting International Friendship** between England and Germany, Germany and France, etc.

6. **The World Peace Foundation,** 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass., founded by Edwin Ginn, with annual income of $50,000; chiefly devoted to educational work, with able experts in America and Europe; departments for colleges, students, lectures, women's organizations, publicity, etc.; issues "International Library," most important existing series of peace works, and many pamphlets on all aspects of the international movement. Edwin D. Mead, chief director; Dr. David Starr Jordan, Norman Angell, Prof. Charles H. Levermore, Dr. James A. Macdonald, Denys P. Myers, Albert G. Bryant, Rev. Charles R. Brown, Prof. William I. Hull and Hamilton Holt, among its leading workers.

7. **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace** incorporated soon after the above in 1910; annual income about $550,000; headquarters, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.; 27 trustees; Hon. Elihu Root, president; secretary and head of its department of International Law, Dr. James Brown Scott; head of the department of Economics and History, Prof. John B. Clarke; head of department of Intercourse and Education, President Nicholas Murray Butler. European headquarters in Paris; lecturers, like Drs. Charles W. Eliot and Hamilton Mabie, sent to Orient; gives aid to peace societies; supports the Association for International Conciliation.

8. **The Garton Foundation** in England which works largely in British and German universities, etc., to spread the ideas emphasized in "The Great Illusion."

9. **The American Peace Society,** with many state branches, welcomes all who desire to replace war by law. Headquarters, Colorado Building, Washington, D.C. President, Senator Burton, of Ohio; secretary, Dr. B. F. Trueblood; exec. director, Arthur D. Call. Its *Advocate of Peace* is given to every member. Annual fee, $1. This is our historic society.

10. **The American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes,** James Brown Scott, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, secretary, lays particular stress upon developing arbitration. **The**

American Society of International Law, Washington, renders distinct service to the cause of peace through its excellent journal and discussions of practical affairs in annual meetings.

11. **Department of Peace in the Federation of Churches** composed of 17 denominations. Secretary, Rev. Frederick Lynch, 215 Fifth Avenue, New York City. This worked valiantly for the passage of the Taft arbitration treaties. There should be a committee on foreign relations in each church to arouse interest over important peace issues in Congress, to promote better relations with foreign-born citizens and insure Sunday-school study of peace.

12. **The General Federation of Women's Clubs,** embracing a million American women, has now its special Peace Committee to promote attention to the cause in all the clubs; and the International Council of Women, representing more than twenty countries, has a Peace department. The World Peace Foundation has a regular department of Women's Organizations, under the direction of Mrs. Anna Sturges Duryea, to whom members of any such organization may apply for material or assistance.

13. **The Mohonk Arbitration Conferences,** founded by Albert K. Smiley and continued by his brother Daniel Smiley, held every May since 1895, composed of about 300 invited guests; these have included the most distinguished jurists, diplomats, delegates from chambers of commerce, clergymen and educators. Annual reports of addresses of great value. H. C. Phillips, secretary.

14. **Labor parties** and Socialist parties the world over are opponents of war. The unprivileged classes are waking to the fact that they sacrifice the most and gain least by war. Some of them propose a general strike when war is declared.

15. **The Active Interest in Peace of the Chambers of Commerce,** as expressed especially in their international congresses, is of vital importance. See pamphlet "Chambers of Commerce for Arbitration." See also pamphlet on "The Grange and Peace," showing the deep interest of our agricultural organizations in the cause.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION.

1. Has your state a branch of the American Peace Society? If so, what are its plans?
2. How many and what Congressmen belong to the American Interparliamentary Group? What does it aim to do? Inquire of Carnegie Foundation, which supplies the secretary for the Group.
3. Why is need of money for the peace cause greater than for most other reforms? Why is so much more spent on palliatives than on preventives?
4. What have peace organizations accomplished? See their year-books.
5. Why are Americans peculiarly bound to lead in the supplanting of war by law?
6. "Foreign Missions and the Peace Movement." See valuable pamphlet by Samuel B. Capen.
7. "The Forces Warring against War." See pamphlet.

BOOKS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

(Referred to in this Outline.)

DAVID STARR JORDAN, "The Blood of the Nation." World Peace Foundation. 15 cents.

DAVID STARR JORDAN, "The Unseen Empire." American Unitarian Association. $1.25.

NORMAN ANGELL, "The Great Illusion." G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.00 net.

Prof. WILLIAM I. HULL, "The New Peace Movement." World Peace Foundation. $1.00.

Prof. WILLIAM I. HULL, "The Two Hague Conferences." World Peace Foundation. $1.65.

ANDREW D. WHITE, "The First Hague Conference." World Peace Foundation. 55 cents.

Prof. HIRAM BINGHAM, "The Monroe Doctrine: An Obsolete Shibboleth." Yale University Press, New Haven. $1.15.

WALTER WALSH, "The Moral Damage of War." World Peace Foundation. 90 cents.

Baroness VON SUTTNER, "Lay down your Arms." American Peace Society. 65 cents.

GUSTAF JANSON, "Pride of War." Little, Brown & Co. $1.30 net.

LUCIA AMES MEAD, "Swords and Ploughshares." *Illustrated.* G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.00.

LUCIA AMES MEAD, "Primer of the Peace Movement." American Peace Society. 10 cents.

LUCILE GULLIVER, "The Friendship of Nations." *Illustrated.* Ginn and Company. 75 cents.

PUBLISHED SINCE THE WAR BEGAN.

"Three Men Behind the Guns." By CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, American Association for International Conciliation, 407 West 117th Street, New York City. Free.

"The War and the Way Out." By G. LOWES DICKINSON, Atlantic Monthly, 3 Park Street, Boston. 10 cents.

"The War: How to Teach it in the Schools." By FANNIE FERN ANDREWS, American School Peace League, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston. Free.

"Woman and War." By EDWIN D. MEAD, World Peace Foundation. Free.

"Japan's Message to America and America's Reply." By Rev. CHARLES F. AKED, Japan Society, Orient Building, San Francisco, Cal.

BOOKS.

"The War and Democracy." By R. W. SETON-WATSON, J. DOVER WILSON, ALFRED E. ZIMMERN and ARTHUR GREENWOOD. Macmillan: London, New York and Boston. 80 cents.

"America and The New World State." By NORMAN ANGELL. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

PAMPHLET SERIES

AMERICA AND THE EUROPEAN WAR. By Norman Angell
AMERICAN LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE AND ARBITRATION. By Carl Schurz
ANGLO-AMERICAN AGREEMENT OF 1817. By Charles H. Levermore
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: THE WILSON-BRYAN PEACE PLAN. By Denys P. Myers
CONCERNING SEA POWER. By David Starr Jordan
DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By Arthur W. Allen
DREADNOUGHTS AND DIVIDENDS. EXPOSURE OF THE ARMAMENTS RING. By Philip Snowden, M.P.
FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. By Hon. William J. Bryan
FORCES WARRING AGAINST WAR. By Havelock Ellis
FOREIGN MISSIONS AND WORLD PEACE. By Samuel B. Capen
HEROES OF PEACE. By Edwin D. Mead
IMMUNITY OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AT SEA. By Joseph H. Choate
INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By Edwin D. Mead
INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By William C. Gannett
INTERNATIONALISM AMONG UNIVERSITIES. By Louis P. Lochner
LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES (Revised). Compiled by Denys P. Myers
MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By David J. Brewer
NATIONAL HONOR AND PEACE. By Louis Broido
NATIONAL HONOR AND VITAL INTEREST. By Russell Weisman
ORGANIZING THE PEACE WORK. By Edwin Ginn
PANAMA CANAL TOLLS: THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES. By Hon. Elihu Root
PANAMA CANAL TOLLS, OUR DUTY CONCERNING. By Thomas Raeburn White and Charlemagne Tower
THE RECORD OF THE HAGUE. Compiled by Denys P. Myers
RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By Charles F. Dole
SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Jackson H. Ralston
SUGGESTIONS FOR LECTURES ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. By Charles H. Levermore
SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the New York *Evening Post*
TO THE PICKED HALF MILLION. By William T. Stead
UNITED STATES OF EUROPE. By Victor Hugo
WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. John W. Foster
WASHINGTON, JEFFERSON AND FRANKLIN ON WAR. By Edwin D. Mead
WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living, 1910
WOMAN AND WAR. Julia Ward Howe's Peace Crusade. By Edwin D. Mead
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: WORK IN 1914

Single copies free. Price in quantities on application

Volume title-pages for binding furnished on request

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
40 Mt. Vernon Street Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid $0.60

AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid . . . 1.65

DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid 60

ETERNAL PEACE AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ESSAYS. By IMMANUEL KANT. 8vo, xxiv+179 pages 75

ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid, .55

FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid 1.65

FIRST HAGUE CONFERENCE. By ANDREW D. WHITE. 8vo, vi+125 pages. Postpaid 55

FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid 3.50

FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid, .65

GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid 55

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid 2.20

INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26–29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid 2.40

MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid 1.00

MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xiii+462 pages. Postpaid 90

NEW PEACE MOVEMENT. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xi+217 pages. Postpaid 1.00

PRIZE ORATIONS OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION. Edited, with introduction by STEPHEN F. WESTON. 8vo, xiii+185 pages. Postpaid 75

PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+189 pages. Postpaid 1.65

SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid, 1.40

TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid . . . 2.20

TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid 1.65

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid 60

WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid 60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOI 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid . . $0.10

BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 82 pages. Postpaid 15

THE COMING PEOPLE. By CHARLES F. DOLE. 4 x 6½ in., xii+224 pages. Seventh edition, with chapter on "The Coming World Order." Postpaid 35

DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 76 pages. Postpaid 20

KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid, .10

LEAGUE OF PEACE, A. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid, .10

PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 125 pages. Postpaid 20

SYLLABUS OF LECTURES ON INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN and EDWARD B. KREHBIEL. 9¼ x 5¾ in., 180 pages. Postpaid . . .75

TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 132 pages. Postpaid. 20

WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 107 pages. Postpaid 20

WHAT SHALL WE SAY? By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 9¼ x 6 in., 82 pages. Postpaid, .35

PLEASE READ AND PASS THIS ALONG

A PACIFIST PROGRAM FOR PREPAREDNESS

BY

MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD

7578.543

Reprinted from the
Advocate of Peace, January, 1916

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

A PACIFIST PROGRAM FOR PREPAREDNESS

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

THE militarists have chosen a clever slogan which is half the battle. All who love foresight, caution, prudence believe in preparedness for all probable exigencies. Up to date, the public seems to be unaware that any kind of preparedness is conceivable, apart from increase of war preparation, except the formation of that far-off world organization which does not deal with immediate problems and that exercise of brotherly love for which professor and congressman, as much as the men in the street, have a profound contempt.

But the pacifist does not ignore immediate problems and has a constructive plan to offer, as well as a protest to make against the hysteria which disgraces America today, and which has perhaps had no counterpart, so far as educated men are concerned, since the witchcraft delusion. Men learned in mathematics, language, and law, now as they did then, seem hypnotized and obsessed. Even college graduates appear as incapable of perceiving relations of cause and effect in our political policy now, as their forbears were two hundred and fifty years ago, of dealing with the phenomena of nature as affected by old women and black cats.

The pacifist program presupposes the truth of Dr. Charles W. Eliot's recent statement that "the danger of a European or Oriental invasion is almost infinitesimal." It also presupposes that this country could never be invaded, and therefore never need a citizen army if it expends its usual naval budget for those submarines, mines, and other coast defenses that have prevented the greatest navy in the world from bombarding a single German port and which have prevented the allied fleets from going through the Dardanelles; and if our Government through legislation lessens possible dangers.

A citizen army, trained to rifle practice, would be as futile for us as it has been necessary for little Switzer-

land, surrounded with old enemies a yard across her border. Moreover, rifle shooting has proved the least important feature of this war, even when fought across adjacent borders. To prepare for possible dangers is madness. We can reasonably prepare only for probable dangers. In the whole history of our Republic we have never been attacked, but ourselves began three quite unnecessary foreign wars. These facts are ignored in the present craze for a futile type of preparedness.

While not, at this time, asking for disarmament or limitation of armaments, the pacifist does ask for an honest, economical expenditure of a naval budget which shall at least be no larger than was that of last year, and which shall be spent solely for purely defensive measures on our coast, and not for still larger battleships, which can only raise the standard of size and expense for the battleships of all nations and which would soon nullify any advantage that they at first gained.

The pacifist proclaims that no successful invasion was ever made by any nation fighting beyond seas, and that no Teutonic or Oriental power could embark sufficient troops, with supplies and fuel and artillery, and approach our shores without, according to careful calculation, giving us at least two months' warning, and without leaving itself dangerously exposed at home.

We are being fooled by the doctrine that if only England had had a million trained men at the start this war might not have happened. But, as *The Westminster Gazette* declared: "It would simply have come sooner."

The following methods are proposed to diminish those possible dangers against which all war preparations are now being made, and which would be vastly more effective in promoting security than the multiplication of armaments would be.

1. *Demand by the United States Government that the Third Hague Conference be called at the earliest possible moment after the war, and immediate plans made by the Government as to the measures which it will propose to the signatory powers to place on the program for the Conference.*

2. *Announcement by our Government of its intention to ask the signatories to the Third Hague Conference to*

neutralize the Latin republics, and thus abolish all excuse for a great navy in the Atlantic to uphold the Monroe Doctrine.

This doctrine, largely expanded since its inception, is now both vague and menacing to the world's peace. It is impossible to believe that any signatory nations could refuse to join in this concerted guarantee without advertising its intention of future aggression. No nation would have anything to lose by such a guarantee, as it knows our intention to fight for its maintenance, even if we have to do it alone. Such an announcement now could change the whole plan for "preparedness," and open up hitherto unconceived possibilities. It could give us at no cost what we now plan to achieve at enormous cost and with ever-increasing danger. The leading Latin republics might well be asked to join with us in this request. Should the neutralization prove impracticable, a Pan-American doctrine should replace the present Monroe Doctrine.

3. *Passage of a bill, already approved by the American Bar Association and urged by Ex-President Taft, which would give federal control and protection over aliens.*

This would lessen possible friction with Japan, and not leave the National Government helpless as it was when Italians were lynched in New Orleans some years ago and Louisiana would not make redress.

4. *A Government Commission of Americans of experience in the Orient, and who hold no political office, and one chosen from eminent Orientals to study the adjustment of all difficulties between our country and China and Japan, to the end that justice and good-will be achieved. This should carefully consider Prof. Sidney L. Gulick's proposals for a solution of the immigration problem so as to put China and Japan on a par with other nations, and at the same time prevent any undue influx of Orientals.*

These commissions would demonstrate the fact that Japan's sole ambitions are for development in Asia, and that all she asks of us is justice. If we refuse to give her that, we do so at our peril. Nations fight now in groups. She is now fighting with allies, and if she ever fought us it would be with an ally behind her.

5. *A promise of independence to the Philippines in the near future and the securing of their neutralization by agreement of all nations interested.*

This would enable us, in the words of a naval officer, "to cut down our navy one-half." It would relieve the apprehensions of those natives who dread American exploitation and the neighborhood of a great American fleet. It would greatly lessen the likelihood of militarism spreading through peace-loving China and the sad diversion of its small resources from education and internal development into costly, short-lived armaments. It would not mean the shirking of any moral obligations, but rather the help of 700,000,000 in Asia and America, instead of merely 7 to 8,000,000 Filipinos. We could still help them in education, and doubtless would be asked to supply paid advisers, as other Asiatic nations have asked us to do. The price of an eighteen-million-dollar battleship given to the Filipinos for education to be administered by ourselves, would be six times as much money as we have ever given them. It will be remembered that they have themselves paid for their education as well as all their other expenses. Our sole gift has been $3,000,000 in the cholera season. A generous gift now to hasten their fitness for self-government by 1925 would relieve tension; it would impress all Asia, and it would be the shrewdest measure that we could adopt to secure permanent, friendly relations beyond sea.

Even should much blundering and some civil strife ensue after independence were granted, it would be no more than we, as well as all other republics, have experienced, and should not deter us from letting the Filipinos learn by doing, especially when our position in the Orient is not for the benefit of all Asia and weakens our power at home.

The neutralization of an isolated archipelago could be secured with assurance that no possible excuse could be given for its invasion such as was offered for the invasion of Belgium.

6. *The announcement by our Government of its policy to take the initiative in forming a League of Nations, perhaps beginning with the American republics, and as*

soon as possible to include all nations, pledged to settle all their difficulties between each other by diplomacy, law, or conciliation, and to use concerted non-intercourse as a penalty for faithlessness to this pledge.

This non-intercourse, if carried out completely, would involve cancellation of passports, copyrights, and patents, and the cutting off of all communication by shipping, railroad, wire, and wireless, and would prohibit war loans. Such a punishment has never yet been inflicted on any nation. It would become more and more terrible according to the number of the nations within the League. The small states of Europe, like Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland, whose joint forces might amount to little, could exercise enormous power in cutting off transmission of supplies. A supertax, or higher tariffs, might be inflicted on a nation that remained obdurate, the amount received to help offset the losses of the nations most inconvenienced by this non-intercourse. While obvious difficulties will at once be recognized, the question to be considered is, What is the *alternative?* Every method of coercion has difficulties. Shall we try this, or remain content with that which is ruining Europe today?

7. *Preparedness to save for real defensive purposes the 600,000 Americans who annually perish from preventable causes, and who have died in less time than Great Britain has lost 600,000 soldiers.*

Germany's best preparation for war was her preparation of her citizens' minds and bodies for peace. As an astute business man, George W. Perkins, has declared: "We as a nation are unprepared for peace." Ill health, reckless loss of life, inefficiency, waste of natural resources, clumsy national housekeeping, as well as graft and greed, create an unpreparedness that would seriously handicap us were we at war. It is significant that Great Britain is now beginning her training of raw recruits with physical training, not military drill, doing in this exigency what civic gymnasia and better education ought to have done long before.

The pacifist believes in real defense for real dangers, but not in preposterous preparedness for hypothetical dangers.

With Norman Angell, he perceives that defence is never for a country, but for that country's policy. Have we any clear policies?

The greatest danger that threatens us today is the poisonous doctrine which is fast making our people panic stricken, suspicious, and is placing a new reliance on force. Prussia is fast conquering us by her theories. Millions of Americans are now convinced that governments rest on force, and that only by increased force can we be safe.

If a bleeding, poverty-stricken Europe is a new menace to us, it is a new menace to the world. If this, the safest nation in the world, feels compelled to increase war preparations, all other nations must follow our example.

Upon our decision hangs the world's decision. When Bismarck was persuaded against his better judgment to take Alsace-Lorraine, he laid the foundation for war in the west which has dragged not only France, but Belgium, England, Canada, Africa, Australia, India, and Japan into war. When Disraeli broke the treaty of San Stefano, he laid the foundation of Balkan strife and the present war in the east. Today we ourselves are laying the foundation for rivalry, ambition, and future trouble. Money, misinformation, and fear are about to force us on the downward path that will lead to world conscription, and probably a future world war, unless in the providence of God blind eyes are opened in time and a strong hand is stretched forth to save us from fatal folly.

Teaching Patriotism and Justice

7578.543

Lucia Ames Mead

Two Papers Read before The American Institute of Instruction in Session at Montreal, July 1-4, 1907.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

THE EMERSON PUBLISHING CO.
ANSONIA, CONN.
1908

Teaching Patriotism.

Within the last fifteen years patriotism in the United States, to use the language of the street, has had a "boom." The salutation of the flag and special exercises for flag day have become general and in many cases obligatory in our states, and now a new National Board, with headquarters at Washington, sends out from the Government Printing Office a "Report on the Feasibility and Advisability of some policy to inaugurate a System of Rifle Practice throughout the Public Schools of the Country." This, it is maintained, will be a "great factor for national peace" and is therefore supposed to be in the interests of patriotism. Within the last ten years our expenditures for the navy have trebled, and this notwithstanding the fact that no foreign foe for ninety years has ever refused to arbitrate with us whenever we have been ready to arbitrate, and notwithstanding the fact that we have not an enemy in the world. Thus far not even the militant nations of the Old World have ever taxed their people to teach school boys the art of killing, and if any of our states yield to this new demand from Washington, as in some quarters has been proposed, it will have no parallel in the civilized world.

It is safe to say that the right or wrong teaching of patriotism in the school is only second in importance to the right and wrong teaching of religion in the home. Whether the future citizen knows anything of cube root or participial adjectives or the names of the planets matters very little to this country. It matters everything, however, whether he has imagination enough to put himself in another's place, whether he

can rule his spirit, whether he is capable of public spirit and gratitude and is capable of discounting sensational jingo journalism.

Whether war or the alarmingly increasing war budgets shall continue to threaten civilization and prosperity depend largely upon the way in which patriotism is taught to the next generation. Patriotism in the popular mind is connected with armies and navies. Most American children conceive of the flag as having some peculiarly close and sacred relation to "the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air;" and the teachers and mothers must themselves be taught otherwise before the teaching of patriotism shall be dissociated from what is partial or superficial and shall incite to genuine service of country. Patriotism means such love of country as leads to service of country. Less and less has service demanded the slaying of our fellowmen. To-day, with the world made capable of organization so as to effect justice between nations, the arbitrament of arms becomes an anachronism and a crime against civilization. Rival armies and navies will be supplanted by a small international police, and neutralization, conciliation and a far greater use of diplomacy will prevent most quarrels, while a Supreme Court carrying out decrees of a World Congress will settle such as remain by judicial process, as they are now settled between our states.

No teacher who believes that war is inevitable in the long future as it was in the long past, no teacher who does not know how to teach the method of world organization and the way to peace can rightly teach how the patriot can best serve his country in the 20th century. But condemnation of future war means no discredit upon the old soldier. War was inevitable

before democracy, steam and electricity changed all the world of business and of international relations as well. It is with no sense of belittling the past heroism of the battlefield that we must now lay emphasis where it is far more needed.

Who are the enemies of the United States? Thank God, nowhere does one exist outside our own borders. Teach the child then that the farmer, the miller, the baker, the doctor, the nurse and the health board, the fireman, policeman, the teacher, preacher and mother are serving their country even more than the man who makes guns or uses them. Teach him that these men and women are fighting the famine, fire, disease, ignorance and sin which are the only real enemies we have and are vastly more deadly and destructive than any foe that ever threatened us in arms. Show him for every man who perished by a bullet fifty have died of preventable disease or have been killed or crippled by preventable causes. Remind him that the United States has been at war less than one-tenth of all her history and that only one small fraction of the male population even then was in arms. If patriotism is a virtue only for the soldier, then 79,900,000 of our 80,000,000 citizens can make no claim to it to-day when we have only 100,000 men in our army and navy. Patriotism, I hardly need say, is a virtue for every citizen to exercise every week of his life—I believe that nineteen-twentieths of it is that much neglected virtue, good citizenship. Civic pride and personal responsibility are sentiments in which our citizens, in spite of many virtues, are shamefully deficient; and to that extent we are an unpatriotic people. The child must be taught that good citizenship is no stupid, humdrum thing, but that it may show the rarest type

of patriotism; for no inspiring drum beat or bugle call, titles, gold lace, medals or pensions throw any glamor over the daily duty of trying to make honest and safe and clean and beautiful the town or village where we live.

If one can not love God whom he hath not seen unless he love his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love his great country which he has not seen, unless he loves the little spot in it where he lives and for which he is most responsible? Unless the citizen of San Francisco or Philadelphia strives early and late to make his boss-ridden, graft-infested city an honorable unit among the sister cities of the land; unless the man who keeps the corner grocery at Podunk Four Corners wins his election as town clerk without giving free drinks to the town vagrants; unless the railroad president thinks of the public more than of stockholders; unless the governor has a conscience like that of Gov. Hughes, let him beware of calling himself by the high and holy name of patriot.

Good citizenship must be irradiated and exalted as the largest and noblest part of patriotism and explicit instructions as to its scope and meaning should frequently accompany the flag salute, otherwise, to the unthinking child, it may become a meaningless fetich worship. More honor should be given to our civic heroes—to the pioneers, explorers, to the police and firemen and coastguard, to the doctors who risk their lives among infected regions, to such men as Col. Waring who saved New York 15,000 lives by his war against filth. Moreover the theory of patriotism must find some practical exemplification, however slight, in such little civic duties as even children can perform, in making backyards beautiful, in keeping streets

clean, in setting out trees and vines, and in studying local beauties and deficiencies with an eye to the public weal. Let the arithmetic class figure up the cost of schools and parks, of city halls, police and firemen, and make comparisons with figures of other times and places and then the cost of national expenses for army, navy, irrigation, lighthouses, etc. Many silent incidental lessons in gratitude and responsibility can be taught without the utterance of the words—simply by setting children to think what all they so freely receive has cost. The first instruction in patriotism will be incidental and not labelled as such. Miss Jane Addams, of Chicago, has well counseled us to make more striking and attractive our peace celebrations. "Why should the Devil have all the good tunes?" Wesley once asked. Why indeed should war alone have the accompaniments of rhythm, music, banners, and gay uniforms? Let us create a pageantry of peace that shall allure the childish eye and ear and give a charm to constructive civic service rather than to the ghastly business of killing thousands of innocent men. Let our election days be heralded with music and pealing bells, let garlands and medals, red sashes, and stirring music be employed to honor the brave defenders of our cities from fire and violence and wrong. Let us give public welcome every year to the new voters who come of age and teach them that men may be deserters, cowards and traitors or heroes and saviors of their country in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Where there is a choice in national anthems, let those most frequently sung be such as deal with the broad, general principles underlying national life—justice, freedom, peace. Let the old superstition expressed in the lines,

"Then conquer we must
When our cause, it is just,"

be always explained as untrue to fact and never left to warp the child's mind from the truth of history.

In the United States, the teacher can find her illustration in the Mexican War which General Grant, who fought in it, rightly declared to have been iniquitous. History is full of records of bloody victories of lions over lambs; war never settles the justice of a cause, and no more important lesson in history can be taught in any school than this. War must needs be taught, for it is impossible to teach history without it, but more and more the causes and results should be emphasized and pictures of slaughter should not be chosen to hang on school room walls. Not only the teacher of history but of literature and geography as well, has daily opportunity to teach the lesson of patriotism and internationalism. Whoever teaches the child to count nothing human foreign to him, who ever makes distant lands and alien peoples seem interesting and familiar, is helping to overcome race prejudice and promote a true sense of human brotherhood. Whoever teaches the immense indebtedness which each child owes his country and makes every part of it seem dear and precious and every one who has served it, revered and honorable, is promoting patriotism. The teaching must be in the home as well as in the school. The teacher's wisdom cannot overcome the effect of the sneer or ridicule that the child hears at home over the teacups when other nations are referred to as less honorable or brave or worthy than his own. The home teaching, though it be incidental, is most important. The child copies all the likes and dislikes of his parents. If they

confound a show of bunting and a noisy Fourth of July orgy with patriotism; if the father goes to his club on the evening of his primary meeting, and the mother cares more for colonial furniture and tablets to her ancestors than for the incoming little Russians and Armenians whom she might help to become good citizens, be sure the children will quickly take their cue from them and look upon civic service as entirely apart from patriotism. Humility and gratitude are rare virtues among Anglo-Saxons, but they are perhaps those most needed, if a patriotism shall be taught which shall promote friendliness instead of suspicion and shall substitute a constant, devoted attention to the service for country which is most needed, instead of the mere pride and national conceit, which so often have masked themselves under the sacred name of patriotism.

Love of family, of city, state, of country and of all mankind are perfectly compatible with one another. The provincialism in the United States, which fifty years ago exalted allegiance to the state above that to the country, has gone forever. But to-day a national provincialism, which is not genuine patriotism, stands in the way of that higher patriotism which transcends the boundaries of country and proclaims with Garrison, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind."

Patriotism, as taught to-day, leaves the supposed patriot frequently faithless to his nearest duty and, on the other hand, makes the geographical boundary lines of his native land the limit of his love and sympathy. The idea of patriotism must expand and strengthen in two directions. It must help purify and defend the nation by overcoming the constant enemies

that are within while, by justice and good will, it must prevent any people from becoming occasional enemies without.

International Justice.

Every age is more or less one of transition. But sometimes there comes a period so revolutionary that after it the world becomes a different world. Such a period was the half century that included the introduction of gun powder, the discovery of America and the invention of printing. Such a period is the one in which we now live when the word "internationalism" is coined to meet the new situation in world history. Whether we look to the fateful struggles in Russia and Siberia, in which one hundred and twenty millions of people are, through tears and blood, slowly working their way to the freedom which we so thoughtlessly enjoy; whether we consider the significance of the labor movement in Europe and the gigantic capitalistic forces in Europe or America, or the carving up of the dark continent by the white races, or the marvelous new civilization in South America; whether we consider the stupendous advance of Japan, of the still more significant reforms in China, which promises in twelve years to establish representative government in a land that comprises one-quarter of the population of the globe; wherever we look, we see that the old order has changed. Never since history began were so many hundreds of millions of people consciously and voluntarily altering their political, their industrial and social conditions. Democracy, steam and electricity have wrought the miracle.

He who argues about international relations as if they were merely different in degree, and not in kind, from those of a century ago, is as shortsighted a person as he who talks of business as if it were to-day as it was in the days ere the average man had been

expropriated from all control over and interest in both the machinery that he uses and the product that he creates.

The steamship and cable, the railroad, telegraph, telephone and modern newspaper and photograph have not merely enlarged business and made international communication quicker. They have produced a moral change. They are forcing nations to substitute interdependence for independence. Some slight concessions of sovereignty are as inevitable if progress is to continue as they were when thirteen colonies began to pave the way for forty-seven states, united so as to achieve justice with permanent peace from ocean to ocean over 80,000,000 people.

To meet the new industrial conditions we are preparing with manual training, trade schools and technological institutes. To meet the new commercial needs we are establishing commercial courses. But very tardily has it dawned on us that for the new international relations we need not only trained consuls and diplomats but a nation of citizens, trained in home and school, to cope with conditions unknown to their forefathers. Two problems, perhaps greater than any others, the 20th century presents to us—the problem of plutocracy and the problem of peace. How to suppress one, how to achieve the other are questions to be solved only by a clearer acquaintance with justice and a new passion for justice. Justice in the industrial and commercial world means more than charity or generosity. Justice in international relations is the prerequisite of peace.

The emblems on every badge worn by the thousands of members of the International Peace Congress in 1904 in Boston and by the National Congress last

spring in New York, were not the dove or olive branch but the scales of justice. It is precisely because rival armies and navies never aim to bring about a judicial decision that civilization is demanding that they be replaced by an international police. War is doomed, not primarily because it causes misery, death and devastation, but because it never can be relied upon to achieve justice and because justice can now be achieved in other ways.

The good tidings of great joy to our generation are that, whereas the 18th century created peace with justice between thirteen states, and the 19th century crated peace with justice between forty-five states, the 20th century is able to achieve peace with justice between all the forty-six nations of the globe. The same general methods of organization that have prevented strife between one state and another for over 100 years, and that can keep the peace between 80,000,000 people covering a territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific, can prevent strife between one nation and another.

Whatever may be said of rebellions, riots, lynchings, which forms of violence must be left to national authorities, international war is not much longer to be a last resort between nations.

The new internationalism is necessitated by new social, moral and industrial relations. The highways of the nations over which thirty thousand millions of dollars worth of commerce yearly pass must be put under a rule of law, and made as safe as streets are for pedestrians. Captains of industry are beginning to demand that disturbers of the world's peace shall be summarily taught that they can not be allowed to obstruct the world's business, and it is dawning on

the minds of statesmen that an Organized World is not only a possibility but a necessity and certainty.

The history that is making this summer at The Hague may be more momentous than all of the combined wars in every land during the last century. No educator, I believe, can truly understand his obligation to his pupils who is not able to relate this new world-movement to his teaching; for nothing that this generation can achieve can avail unless the rising generation is prepared to meet the new demands which science and democracy have created. He must understand and appreciate much more than he can tell his pupils, if he would rightly co-ordinate each fact and principle in his teaching; if he would see the teaching of patriotism, of geography, history, literature all related to and transfigured by the new elements which are entering into our modern consciousness.

The school must not only interpret this growing consciousness of human brotherhood but must perhaps be the chief instrument in its realization; for it is largely an intellectual matter and therefore something which neither church nor home is fitted to teach so well as the school. Many a man who is devoted to family and church and country is a rank skeptic as to any possibility of ever ending war, and is confident that only a great navy can assure his country from invasion. He, if a citizen of the United States in school-boy days a quarter of a century ago, was allowed to grow up with a notion that King George's folly toward the colonists was approved by England, that England was all wrong and the colonists all right in the revolution, and that politeness forbids mentioning Lexington or Independence Day when talking to English friends, lest they be sensitive. It was this

ignorance which ignored Chatham, Fox and Burke and the noble Englishmen who "rejoiced that the colonies had resisted;" it was this strange forgetfulness of American Tories and failure to recognize that the war was between the progressive and retrogressive parties on both sides the Atlantic that chiefly caused that week of brewing belligerency a dozen years ago over the first Venezuelan affair. Our citizens did not then realize, as they are now beginning to do, that English children are taught to admire George Washington and to understand the Revolution just as we understand it.

Not only must past history be taught so as to encourage the judicial mind and prevent national prejudices, but the history that is now making in the direction of world organization must be understood. The logical steps must be made familiar to every boy and girl who is old enough to understand the meaning of executive, judicial and legislative functions. He must be taught that peace between nations can come like peace between cities and states only by organization; that it involves no miraculous change in human nature and does not demand for its accomplishment the regeneration and education of the ignorant masses of the globe. It involves only the intelligent co-operation of the most influential in a few leading nations. Less than one hundred men in 1787 worked out in four months the scheme for a United States. One million statesmen, editors and teachers, working to inspire two hundred and fifty delegates in two or three successive Hague Conferences, could produce a United World in which rival armies and navies would be useless and would disappear. We, as belonging to two of these leading nations, have a peculiar responsibility. Should England and America, which have

settled every difficulty for ninety years by judges or commissions or diplomats, agree to settle all future difficulties in the same manner and to invite any nation that liked to join them in a similar compact, and together to ostracize any other nation that refused to arbitrate a difficulty with any one of these, we should see the speedy end of war. France would readily join us two and these three nations standing together and cutting off commerce, mails and diplomatic relations with any recalcitrant nation could bring her speedily to terms without any threat of bloodshed. Organized, passive resistance is the mightiest of weapons. It touches every purchaser and seller, while a battleship affects only coast towns. No nation would hold out a week against it if two or three nations even threatened it. It would become the last resort instead of war. The Hague Court, as Justice Brewer of our Supreme Court has well said, will never need armed force to compel compliance to its decisions.

The power of neutralization of weak peoples by mutual consent of the delegates at a World Congress is one of the least understood and most powerful preventives of war. Should we neutralize our dangerous and expensive insular possessions and give them independence, we could at once lessen our navy one-half. Norway and other small communities are asking for neutralization that they may secure protection and devote all their income to internal improvements. Let money loans, like guns, be made contraband of war and that alone would end war. Neither Russia nor Japan could have fought had it not been for borrowed capital.

What are the necessary steps to world peace? First, a regular World Congress, advisory at the out-

set, but gradually enlarging its functions. Second, a general treaty of arbitration to be entered into by all the signatory powers at The Hague, as inclusive in its scope as possible. This must be enlarged until it eventually pledges all nations to send all quarrels to the World Court.

Pending the settlement of all questions between nations by diplomacy or by judicial procedure, the following measures are of vital importance. One is a pledge that before declaration of hostilities, difficulties between nations shall be examined by friendly nations and a peaceful solution suggested, as happened in the case of the North Sea disaster two years ago, which was satisfactorily ended by a commission sitting in Paris. Another measure is immunity from capture of private property at sea in time of war. This, as Sir Robert Reid has declared, would relieve England of the necessity of a great navy to protect her merchant marine. When England lowers her navy all other nations can afford to follow suit. Lastly, the measure for which the Tsar called the first Hague Conference to consider—gradual, proportionate disarmament. The Conference began without premeditation and by attacking the wrong end of the problem compelled it to be reserved to a later time until its logical precedent,—a permanent Tribunal,—could be established.

The 20th century teacher must put before his pupils a new motto—"In time of peace, prepare for peace;" and his best illustration will be that unprotected borderland between the United States and British America which, 90 years ago, was, by mutual consent, made safe by the agreement to permit no battleships or forts along the whole border line.

The teacher must himself know what an organized world involves and the steps by which it is to be reached. Every year as Peace Day—the 18th of May—comes round, let him take as much time to tell of The Hague Tribunal and Hague Conference on that one day as he does to tell the story of wars on each of fifty other days in the school year. Let the whole study of human relations in commercial geography, literature and history be transfigured by the spirit of Peace Day, and thus, with Christmas and memorial days, may its teachings of the great new possibilities of peace and justice illumine the lessons of all other days.

NOTE:

The Second Hague Conference achieved far more than was made evident by its signed agreements for which absolute unanimity was required. Certain important matters received the support of a very large majority, which marked a great moral advance. The United States was relieved by the Porter-Drago resolution of any future anxiety as to the settlement of contractual debts by South American powers for which it had been assumed we might, upon occasion, be obliged to use our navy. A World Court, in addition to the Arbitration Tribunal already established, was agreed upon, the bombardment of unfortified towns forbidden and steps taken to make the Third Hague Conference to convene in not more than eight years, properly prepared for and effective. A Prize Court, proposed by Germany, was decreed, which indicates the advance of this military nation towards limiting her sovereignty and is important as a precedent. These and other measures, together with the perfect courtesy and good will which prevailed among these representatives of forty-four powers, marked this first parliament of man as the greatest assembly in human history and big with promise for the future.

By Lucia Ames Mead.

Teaching Patriotism and Justice, 3c

Primer of the Peace Movement, 5c

Am. Peace Society,
31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

Patriotism and the New Internationalism, 20c

A Manual for Teachers, 134 pp.
Ginn & Co.,
29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

All postpaid.

THE SOLE REMEDY FOR WAR

7578.543

by

LUCIA AMES MEAD

World Unity Magazine
Reprint No. 12

WORLD UNITY MAGAZINE

4 EAST 12TH STREET, NEW YORK

A STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Issued October 1, 1927

WORLD UNITY MAGAZINE, as its title implies, will endeavor to interpret and record those significant changes in present-day thought which mark the trend toward worldwide understanding and a humanized civilization able to release the finer aspirations of mankind.

Its essential purpose is to make accessible to awakened minds the views and conclusions of creative workers on subjects of truly general interest and importance. The emergence of new and higher values in philosophy, science, religion, ethics and the arts from the alembic of universal unrest represents the focal point of vision for World Unity Magazine.

To create a medium capable of responding faithfully, without prejudice of race, creed, class or nationality, to the uprush of the spirit of the age wherever or however manifested—this is the ideal to which World Unity Magazine is devoted; and faith in humanity arising at last to assert its organic oneness, the foundation on which it stands.

Constructive suggestions will be heartily welcomed from progressive individuals and organizations to assist the Magazine to fulfill its function as a clearing-house of ideas and plans reflecting the organic trends of the age toward world unity and cooperation. The Magazine will endeavor to publish significant articles of a stimulating character, without assuming responsibility for its contributors' views.

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

THE SOLE REMEDY FOR WAR

by

LUCIA AMES MEAD
Author and Lecturer

A DISTRAUGHT world, in which the richest nations have heavy deficits, and some are approaching bankruptcy, looks with grave anxiety to the meeting of the delegates of the nations at Geneva in February, 1932. If this Disarmament Conference, so long delayed since the disarmament of Germany, and certain to be one of the most momentous conferences of modern times, succeeds in cutting down fifty percent the outgo for war preparations, which is more than we dare hope, it will bring the world back only to the armament status of 1913. It would be a step, but a tremendous step towards reducing colossal waste, lessening tension and anxiety and forestalling the internal revolutions which threaten when 20,000,000 unemployed are hungry and in dispair. The bankers at Basle, the professors at Williamstown and the three premiers whom we heard at the great Albert Hall meeting in London in July, declaim one message. The solution of appalling economic problems depends largely on the previous solution of certain political problems. Why is the world poor in the midst of plenty? It is chiefly because of lack of foresight, national conceit and stubbornness and fear. In all this we Americans have great responsibility. We refuse to help build up a community fire-department before fire breaks out. We wait to see the blaze before pledging ourselves to any action. We have been willing to take the risks of war, but shudder at any risks for peace. We talk about our being the most peaceful people in the world, but we are doing problably more than any other to delay adequate world organization which is the sole remedy for war. The dangerous old fallacy that war is

rooted in human nature, that it always has been and always will continue until the millennium, is the presupposition of most of the doctrine taught in military schools and in public schools and colleges where over 1700 army instructors are indoctrinating about 150,000 students. These never learn of the sole remedy for war. They rely on armed force to keep the peace. What is the genesis of war?

When the primitive man with the Neanderthal skull and his few scattered contemporaries in the woods and caves began progress toward civilization, he was handicapped and has always been handicapped by three obstacles—Ignorance, Poverty and Selfishness. These are, in the days of the radio and aeroplane, still man's chief obstacles and will remain so for centuries to come. There are still a thousand million illiterates in a world of seventeen hundred million people. There are millions starving and hundreds of thousands now dying of famine. Yet there is now intelligence enough in the world to wipe out illiteracy and poverty within a generation or two were it not that mankind is still spending billions of dollars annually for war preparations and has made such a hole in the world's wealth by the World War that progress, moral and financial, has had an unnecessary and frightful set-back.

War was unknown to the caveman, though doubtless he occasionally clubbed his neighbor with spasmodic wrath, one with whom he usually had to unite in the fierce struggle for life in an environment full of danger from wild beasts, accident and hunger. It was countless ages before prehistoric man was capable of waging war. He had first to invent language, thereby showing his infinite supremacy to creatures that inherited barks and squeals and grunts and never rise to the creation of a symbol that is a universal sign of an idea. "Man is a symbol-making animal," said Aristotle. Man's invention of language was the greatest invention ever made. Subsequently, he clumsily wrought implements and finally crude weapons. He slowly learned to organize, but it was countless ages before he made possible collective, organized slaughter of two opposing bodies of human beings. Conscription and war, as we know it, is a very modern thing. Primitive man saw few enemies;

he could travel only as far as his feet could carry him; he had no private property in land; mutual aid, as Kropotkin showed, was an important element in his progress. War has always been childish and almost futile, though inevitable among childish thinkers. Today it is insanity in an interdependent world and the threat and fear of it undermine all the constructive work that man performs. War is alien to the beasts; they fight only to get food. Man is the only animal who deliberately destroys his own species in collective action. No pack of wolves goes out to slay another pack of wolves, nor do lions and tigers destroy their own species. Man's wars have become more widespread, more costly and terrible as his knowledge of science has grown. He has with the utmost misconception of his own interest imagined that he could create security by rival armies. Today, however, no nation dares apologize for aggressive war and it always claims that its wars are purely for defence.

President Hoover has recently assured us that we are spending more for military purposes than any other nation. This is $802,900,000 as our latest estimate for a year, as compared with $580,000,000 in 1926, since when we have had no increase of danger. We are the safest nation in the world, the only one protected by two oceans; contrast this with Great Britain within gunshot of the continent and having, with her imperial possessions, twice our coast line to protect. No nation has ever declared war against us. In all our five foreign wars, beginning with the Revolution and including the World War, we lost fewer than 75,000 in battle though in the last war alone, ten million of the strongest and ablest young men of Europe were burned, and bombed, and blown to pieces and twice as many more were starved and crippled. We have lost in battle fewer than we have had murdered in the last ten years! Our "defence" is grossly excessive compared with our danger.

How is the "next war," for which the nations are so vigorously preparing, to be side-tracked? The Legion and the War Department have demanded a universal draft law which, even before war begins, would put the powers of a dictator into the hands of the President. They proposed to have him draft labor, industry, mines,

railroads, to control banks and regulate prices; but as former Commander Safford of the Legion said, "We cannot draft capital, as that would be against the Constitution and would make us the United States of Soviet America." The Grundy-Snell Resolution which provided a commission to study the question and report in January 1932 passed both House and Senate; this does not permit conscription of labor, much to the regret of the Army and Navy Journal which declares that the exemption of any one class is in violation of the preamble of the Constitution.

We, with about sixty other nations, have solemnly renounced war as a national policy and pledged ourselves to seek only pacific means of settlement of every international dispute. But the army and navy and munition workers, serenely ignoring this, have been working night and day for more armaments and more contracts. The London Naval Parley of 1930 brought a little limitation but no reduction of armaments. Our delegates stressed parity of tonnage instead of parity of security. If we now build up to the permitted parity, which is wholly needless, it will inevitably incite the other nations to increase their forces.

What is the practical American to do in the present ominous situation? He must certainly use swifter and stronger methods than simply trying to remove racial and religious prejudices, rivalry between capital and labor and those internal frictions which will occur for an indefinite future. World War will annihilate civilization if we merely wait for educative and religious influences to abolish the war system. Naturally we must continue to have Leagues of Neighbors, and World Religious conferences; but until more speedy and drastic action is attempted, civilization is in peril. There has been much ineffective talk about brotherly love, relegating it to some far-off day for the end of war. It confounds disputes with war. Disputes, racial, financial, religious, and national will break out for an indefinite time; but disputes are not war. Our problem is to settle these disputes when they arise even more than to prevent their arising. Shall it be by conciliation or judicial decision, or shall it be by explosives destroying conscripts who on both sides are irresponsible and innocent?

The chief refutation of the popular notion that we must wait for religion and goodwill to control, before we end the systematic cutting of each other's throats, is our own Constitution and history. When, in 1787, Washington, Franklin and Madison, and their colleagues in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia faced the problem of thirteen quarrelsome colonies, on the verge of disintegration, they wasted no time in going up and down the land preaching brotherly love and imploring people to obey the Golden Rule. Their genius worked out effective practical methods which have prevented any war ever occurring between one state and another state despite the fact that within each state we have had, all told, the worst record for homicide and crime. Around the border line of each state we have had peace with justice. This came from adequate organization which we must reiterate is the sole remedy for war between nations as we have found it to be between states. Unwittingly the framers of the Constitution not only solved their own problem but worked out the method that the world must follow if it achieves peace with security. They made it easy to do right; to have disputes settled between states without bloodshed. They asked each state to surrender a little of its former sovereignty and to leave to the national government interstate matters. They set up the Supreme Court which since then has settled about 90 interstate disputes, without which we should have had many little wars and broken into fragments. They asked New York to surrender the obnoxious tariff which made her neighbors irritated and wrathy.

Free trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific has done far more to promote the sense of goodwill than all the preaching we have ever had about brotherly love. Our three great, practical, outstanding achievements to promote interstate peace show what the world must do for international peace. We must extend the application of our own teaching, be willing to surrender our isolation and to pledge ourselves, not only to pay our little quota to the World Court but, as the other great states are doing, to refer every legal case at issue to it. We should join the League of Nations.

Had adequate political machinery been ready, the World War could have been prevented. The peoples did not want war. When years ago, Pastor Wagner of France in an American pulpit placed his hand on his heart and said "War is here," he spoke less than a half-truth. War does not come from blood-lust or sheer deviltry. It comes from the presence of a disorganized society.

Many peace advocates inveigh against "artificial measures." They distrust "political machinery." True, mere paper contracts are worthless, and it is only public consent which makes our Constitution valid. In like manner, we must put aroused public sentiment behind the Disarmament Conference, League of Nations, the Locarno, Briand-Kellogg and other treaties and expedite further legal measures to outlaw war and bring sense of security. The world has gone two-thirds of the way toward world peace; but without drastic cut in armaments, which will come solely from an informed and earnest public, can we complete world-organization so that it is adequate to prevent another world catastrophe?

Admirals and generals, highly trained and sincere technicians in the art and science of war, too often conjure up fantastic bugaboos of danger. They are not statesmen. Charles E. Hughes—who is a statesman—has said: "So far as we can see into the future, the United States is not in the slightest danger of aggression. In no single power and in no possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security."

SOME FALLACIES OF CAPTAIN MAHAN

BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD

BOSTON:
ALFRED MUDGE & SON, INC., PRINTERS
1908

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

SOME FALLACIES OF CAPTAIN MAHAN.

By Lucia Ames Mead.

A thousand women in their clubs throughout the country vehemently discuss the ethics involved in giving an overdose of chloral to shorten the death agonies of one's best beloved. A thousand men sign a petition to abolish the execution of convicted murderers. Why is it that perhaps not a hundred in either thousand are making practical and earnest effort to end the killing of myriads of able-bodied, innocent men in war?

There are several reasons for this paradox. The power to put one's self in the other fellow's place, to read statistics with the illumination of imagination and sympathy, is less developed at school than the power to recite exceptions to the rule governing the dative case. A mangled dog in sight compels more tears than the thought of twenty thousand mangled men in Manchuria. Moreover, we are under the obsession of the tradition that the military expert must inevitably best understand the problem of national defense and that the latter implies armaments solely. When, therefore, a distinguished naval expert and exemplary Christian gentleman discourses on this theme and tells us that war is inevitable, the layman is overawed and dumb. How should one who knows nothing of battleships or of the trajectory of projectiles presume to talk on national defense?

Because national defense depends on many other things than armies and navies; because the military man, with his specialized training, is the very last man to be aware of these, and the layman — the tourist, merchant or diplomat — who has come into contact with other nations in normal relations may know many things about national defense that the man who studies life in abnormal conditions of war misses.

Said a retired United States rear admiral during the Boer War: "I tell you what England ought to do. She ought to whip France." "What, now, when her hands are tied in South Africa?" exclaimed his friend, aghast. "Yes, yes; it would do good and clear the air," was the testy response. "But do you mean to have her go to war about nothing?" "Yes, yes; she could do it and clear the air." Ability to manage a squadron implies little knowledge of statesmanship or international ethics; although, of course, the above gross instance was exceptional and would be as readily condemned by Captain Mahan as by a Quaker.

But Captain Mahan's misconceptions and errors regarding the aims and arguments of the new peace party are typical and therefore important to analyze. First, he darkens understanding by defining war to suit his own fancy and uses the

term indiscriminately to cover the literal and figurative use of the word as well as civil war, international war, past war and future war. All conflict he considers war, saying: "All organized force is, by degree, war." It should be clearly understood that the peace party opposes only organized, deliberate killing of human beings; its members themselves often share in righteous and necessary conflicts which do not involve the deliberate killing of innocent men. Many ludicrous instances of addled ideas on this subject might be adduced to show the danger in thoughtless use of terms which confound war with all forms of force. In a certain city the window of a church bookshop was filled with gay, alluring juvenile books on war. A press comment on the incongruity of such a spectacle instantly elicited a silent answer (?) to the protest; a large picture of Jesus overturning the tables of the money-changers was placed beside the books! A naïve newspaper reporter once assumed that my objection to international war would involve comdemnation of football; and another youth based his supposed disagreement from my position upon his having been obliged to threaten to knock down an insulting companion if he repeated his insult. "But you would not kill him, would you?" I inquired. "Of course not," was his horrified response. "But I was talking about killing," I rejoined. "Oh, is that the point? Killing? Yes, yes, I see," was his relieved reply.

The muddle-headedness which discerns only a difference in degree and not in kind between organized killing and an organized boycott, or the wholesome thrashing of a schoolyard bully, or such war of words as was waged by the non-resistant, William Lloyd Garrison, seems to be a weakness of many religious journals as well as of military men. The constant assumption that those who condemn future international war are spineless weaklings, devoid of patriotism and the spirit of struggle and adventure, is due to precisely this careless confounding of a form of contest — war — with those manifold other forms of contest in which all brave men should take a valiant part.

Secondly, Captain Mahan's classing of international war with all other forms of strife leads to his conceiving it impossible to end any one form of violence until all are ended. The cause of universal peace he holds is "nothing more than the cause of universal education." The abolitionists of war are in a measure to blame for the common confusion of thought thus evinced. At the National Peace Congress in New York, I do not recall a speaker who called attention to the sharp distinction to be drawn between international war, which can be ended by proper organization, and civil war, lynchings, murder, which cannot be thus ended. Only one leaflet distributed by the committee in charge made clear that "these are in another category from inter-

national war." The failure to make this clear distinction is largely responsible for the widespread assumption that peace advocates are attempting the impossible or what is possible only in the millennium. If international war could end only when other forms of violence cease, the new peace party, which is animated by the hope of ending it within a century, would indeed be a throng of dreamers and deserving of the amused contempt they so often have received. It is precisely because the end of international war does not require the general education of the world, but only the active coöperation of a slight fraction of the most intelligent, that it may be accomplished a thousand years before other forms of violence have wholly disappeared and before licentiousness, corruption, greed, intemperance, all deeply rooted in existing industrial and social conditions, can cease. The few who will accomplish this are editors, parliamentarians, captains of industry and labor, teachers and preachers in five or six of the great nations of the world — one or two million persons, all told. To achieve international peace the bulk of fifteen hundred million people on the globe is negligible. Let the leading nations begin disarmament, and all others will be only too glad to follow their leadership. China's 400,000,000 will be only too thankful to save their taxes for constructive purposes when relieved of the menace of the great powers. Neither Hague Conferences nor Hague Courts will prevent or settle civil strife. Theoretically that may break out indefinitely, though practically it would be less frequent as international war ceased. But the prohibition of war loans, advocated by Richard Cobden and recently by Secretary Straus and Hon. William J. Bryan, might indirectly bring outside influence beneficently to bear on civil as well as on international war.

Eliminate from consideration our two civil wars — the Revolution, "fought between the progressive and retrogressive parties on both sides of the Atlantic,"* and the Rebellion — and the consideration of our own problems becomes much easier and the objector more easily answered. We are seen to have had no wars since the Revolution except those of our own making. The Mexican War, General Grant, who fought in it, justly called iniquitous; and, if Minister Woodford's official letters from Spain fairly state the case, many are justified in the conclusion that, had it not been for yellow journalism and the blowing up of the "Maine" from some still unknown cause, we might, by other methods, have relieved Cuba without war and its subsequent entanglements in the East. In regard to our wars with foreign powers, which, during over ninety years, have lasted only two and a half years and have involved no invasion, there is serious difference of opinion as to their excuse. The consideration of war problems is greatly simplified when clear

* John Fiske.

definitions remove the fog which vague and varied use of terms by even such masters of English as Captain Mahan throw around the difficult subject. When it is seen that abolitionists of war share the general reverence for the heroes of Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, and, in general, are wasting little time in condemning wars which took place before substitutes for war were provided, much of the hostile criticism towards their efforts is shown to be irrelevant.

Thirdly, Captain Mahan derides the efficacy of organization as a promoter of peace because human nature is not likely to change much for many a century. He writes: "There are no short cuts by which men may be made peaceful. If the world could have been saved by an organization it would have been saved a thousand years ago by the Christian Church." The fallacy here is in confounding States with individuals. In 1787, less than one hundred men worked out in our Constitutional Convention the method which has prevented war between any two of our own states ever since. In like manner, a comparatively few, even of the one or two millions above mentioned, will work out the methods of preventing war between any two nations.

All this involves no more change of human nature than that which has made a strong, united Germany out of a score or more of separate units within a generation; it involves no better human nature than that which exists in our own country without war *between* one state and another, although we are preëminent in homicides and lynching *within* our states. Human nature doubtless is improving, and improving faster than fruits and flowers under the magic hand of Luther Burbank; but it is organization, not improved human nature, which prevents such old-time wars as were carried on between Italian cities in the days of Dante and Saint Francis. The Christ of the Andes, which commemorates the pledge of eternal peace between Chili and Argentina when they escaped imminent war by arbitration, is one of many refutations of Captain Mahan's statements, so far as governments are concerned. This does not mean that individuals of the two nations will never commit murder, or that they have not latent the possibility of fiendish conduct upon sufficient provocation. Organization removes the provocation between states, and leaves evil possibilities deeply latent, never to be realized. The reason that most Americans are not throwing bombs at officials, like the oppressed and maddened Russian revolutionist, is because their innate deviltry has no occasion to develop in that direction. It goes without saying that no loose organization of believers like the "Christian Church" can ever remove the tariff walls and the political and economic obstructions which create hostility; this, constitutions and treaties can alone effect.

The United States Supreme Court was the shortest cut to

peace that the world ever saw, and, though it could not prevent rebellion of one half the nation against the Federal government, it has prevented perhaps a dozen interstate conflicts. At this moment Virginia and West Virginia are having a suit over a question involving $15,000,000, which will be settled without strife or ill feeling, and the majority of citizens in both States will hardly know of its existence. Much smaller differences have led to wars between European countries. The average nation, much more than the average man, keeps the peace when this is made easy. International organization of self-governing peoples is the short cut to international peace. Captain Mahan's claim that peace can be attained only by "that same slow process by which we have attained our present civilization" ignores the fact that, in this age of endless forms of organization, rapid communication and widespread education, the progress of past centuries is now being equalled in decades, not merely in material achievements, but in mental and spiritual advance. With one bound, China has advanced intellectually more in ten years than in the previous thousand. Japan and Mexico in fifty years have achieved more than in two hundred previously. International peace no more demands the "slow processes" of the past than does international business. In fact, it is the demand of the constructive business mind that the lack of law and insecurity now evidenced by the existing system of defense shall cease. At present, this system in our own country consumes nearly seventy per cent of the total national revenue — by which is meant that more than two-thirds of our entire national income are applied to paying for past and possible future wars, leaving less than a bare third for constructive purposes. What is true of us is substantially true of European nations.

Besides failing to draw distinction between international and civil war, Captain Mahan still further darkens understanding by confounding in one category all forms of repressive force. He asserts that the abolitionists of international war are practically saying, "It is wicked for society to organize and utilize force for the control of evil." Now only Tolstoi and his very few followers hold that all use of physical force is wrong. Not one in fifty of the opponents of international war takes that view. But, just as they discriminate between the kind of war which an organized world can speedily end and civil war, which it cannot thus prevent, so they distinguish between the use of a minimum of force necessary to achieve a judicial decision and the use of the maximum of force to settle questions irrespective of a judicial decision. The peace party believes in police; the latter's business in common civil society is, so far as it uses force at all, to use the least amount necessary to get a man before twelve disinterested jurymen and a judge, to have his case tried by law,

after evidence has been given. The police have no right to execute punishment themselves, nor to beat any man who goes readily to court. The militia is a State police, intimidating lynchers and rioters, but never pursuing and shooting a mob that disperses on the reading of the riot act. Upon occasion, both police and militia may be forced to kill men who defy law and judicial procedure, if there is no way of getting them to court; but they do not set out to do this. Their type of force will remain so long as criminals exist. But a civilized community will permit no other type. Only uncivilized communities will much longer tolerate the international duelling called "war," which never aims to get a judicial decision and never provides for the equal weapons and "fair play" which is always demanded even in the duel between two individual combatants.

War is to be condemned primarily, not because it means death and destruction but because it never aims at justice and never achieves any measure of justice, except accidentally, incidentally and partially. Perhaps no fallacy is more widespread and dangerous than the idea that armies and navies are a "national police." True, they are occasionally called on for police functions, as when California and Jamaica earthquakes render assistance necessary. But food can be sent in vessels without ten inches of armor plate, and this occasional activity of war-vessels no more makes them a police force than the grocer's fighting of a forest fire at the demand of the fire-warden makes him by profession a fireman. A genuine police aims always either at kindly, protective work, like catching runaways and hunting lost children, or at getting a criminal before a court of law. The police of one city never fight the police of another city. A navy is a tool of government which is created for the settlement of difficulties by force, by dint of strategy and explosives, irrespective of justice. A navy exists simply that it may fight another navy.

The abolitionists of war stand for justice as the paramount issue. It was with definite purpose that the scales of justice, and not the dove or olive branch, were placed upon the badges of the delegates at the great International Peace Congress in Boston and at the National Peace Congress in New York. The peace party makes no "mollycoddle" plea about hardship and pain; it has no craven fear of death. But it abhors, in this age of enlightenment, the beast's way of settling issues by tooth and claw and the devil's way of blowing up by treacherous mines the innocent victims of a government which votes to settle boundary-lines or questions of "honor" by explosives.

But to Captain Mahan this way is a valuable and revered method of settling "those momentous differences which cannot be settled by arbitration." He finds in arbitration no practicable solution for various new racial and economic problems that are looming up portentously. He is much concerned over questions

involving the national conscience, and says: "There is an absolute indisposition, an instinctive revolt against signing away, beforehand, the national conscience by a promise that any other arbitrator than itself shall be accepted in questions of the future." Why, we ask, should there not be an instinctive revolt to the only alternative to this that Captain Mahan can suggest — namely, settlement of questions of conscience by explosives? Which is the more likely to settle any questions justly, the body of judges, fallible, to be sure, like all other mortals, but under oath and the eyes of the world carefully investigating evidence and rendering a verdict, or an admiral who knows nothing of the points at issue, but knows only where to send torpedo-boats to destroy the most life and property? Which settlement, be it absolutely just or not, leaves the least rancor — Bismarck's and Napoleon's method at Sedan, or the commission in London which settled the Alaska boundary? But Captain Mahan does not seem to concern himself about justice in these international affairs. He admits that war does not settle an ethical question. The impossibility of a nation's being an impartial judge in its own case does not appear to affect him when condemning arbitration of the more important international difficulties.

Captain Mahan's references to wars of religion in the past are irrelevant to the future. Such wars as may come will be for markets or territory or privilege. His assumption that questions of honor cannot be arbitrated is not held by the governments of Holland, Denmark, the five Central American States, Chili and Argentina, which have all signed treaties to arbitrate every question — rational conduct which it is to be hoped Captain Mahan's own country may speedily emulate. Questions of "conscience" today belong chiefly to domestic politics, like slavery, suffrage, socialism, education and temperance. When the abuse of weaker peoples, like the Armenians, becomes a question of "conscience" a joint conference of Powers and the employment of organized ostracism can accomplish what no single nation can achieve by forcible aggression and dictatorship.

Three powerful adjuncts to arbitration as means of promoting a rational settlement of difficulties are completely ignored by Captain Mahan. One — a peace budget — has not yet been widely broached, but is big with promise for the future. It was one of the recommendations made by the Interparliamentary Union, composed of the statesmen of the world, at their great meeting in London in the summer of 1906. Had one dollar been devoted to peace for every thousand in the annual war budget, it would have given us $200,000 in 1906. This, put into the hands of a commission appointed by the President, would have enabled us to invite here fifty eminent Japanese and to have sent fifty of our distinguished citizens to Japan. It would have provided for an interchange of thought, receptions,

lectures, innumerable courtesies, and have led to a vastly better understanding, besides providing for systematic, helpful work in the press and pulpit of the Pacific Coast — worth easily the cost of a battleship in assuring hysterical citizens of safety. The enormous value of a common-sense *rapprochement* between England and France, the helpful interchange of visits and courtesies between English and German editors and merchants within the last two years, Secretary Root's friendly visit to South America and his kindly offices in helping towards peace between the States of Central America, are but a slight beginning of the great, systematic work of conciliation to be done in case of incipient friction, long before arbitration should be employed. This should play an enormous part in the future program of the American government, which makes such loud claims of its pacific purposes. This must be in addition to increased official and diplomatic measures, and largely be entrusted to tactful specialists and journalists. England's Chancellor of the Exchequer has at this very moment given the pledge of his government to the establishment of a peace budget, the value of which he warmly recognizes. It is probable that the price of one battleship, wisely expended in three or four leading nations, could do more for the peace of the world than all its combined navies. There are a score of rich American citizens who could individually accomplish a work of specific education in world organization which would alter the whole future history of the planet in this regard, had they the foresight, shrewdness and good-will to do it.

A second measure of great promise, which increased organization renders possible, is the neutralization of weak and exposed regions, like the Philippines, thus freeing them from danger of aggression, with the consequent reduction, and in the latter case, of one half our navy as soon as we grant them the independence which President-Elect Taft has definitely promised. An immediate act by Congress making absolute and definite this pledge is the first step towards lowering the demand, now beginning, for sustaining two great navies — one in the Pacific and one in the Atlantic. No nation, of course, could refuse the request of our government to guarantee autonomy and neutrality to the archipelago when we withdraw. A refusal would be tantamount to advertising prospective aggression. The neutralization of Switzerland, Belgium, Norway and other places and the self-renouncing agreement between England and the United States to have the three thousand miles of borderland between the United States and Canada unguarded are some of the notable beginnings in the use of a method which will play a gigantic part in the future in sidetracking jealousy and preventing friction. Who can question that when France, Great Britain, Germany and Russia "agree together to respect her autonomy and to act in

concert in her support if she should be menaced by any Power," Norway is now free to spend her meager resources in building herself up, instead of guarding her frontier? The agreements, signed in 1908 in Berlin and St. Petersburg by the Powers bordering on the North Sea and the Baltic, to respect each other's territorialty is a matter of great moment which has received amazingly little attention. What is to prevent every weak spot on the globe from becoming thus guarded as soon as the few influential minds of the world come to realize that there is a force stronger than armour plate — a force of which they are as oblivious today as, a dozen years ago, they were oblivious of wireless telegraphy or the gyroscope?

Another force also is ignored by Captain Mahan; it is the force of non-intercourse. China, whom he speaks of as "at the mercy of the so-called Christian nations," was not only the inventor of gunpowder, but the employer of a force which, when adopted by the western world, may prove more efficacious than the explosive which the nations so readily accepted and employed. Even a few unorganized Chinese merchants, unsupported by their government, were able, in a nation without a navy, to bring to some measure of justice our great nation with a navy second only to England's, when their boycott of our goods, a few years ago, wrought havoc in the cotton trade. Their recent boycott of Japanese goods has quietly secured the desired concessions. What would not be the power of 400,000,000 organized Asiatics backed by their government if, twenty-five years from now, they should unite to refuse to deal with any nation that had wronged them and transfer their trade to a more friendly one? Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court well says that the Hague Court will never need an army or navy behind it to enforce its decisions. "If all the civilized nations would say," to a recalcitrant government, "'From this time forward, until you submit your dispute to arbitration, we will withdraw our diplomatic representatives, we will have no official communication with you, we will forbid our citizens having any business transactions with your citizens, we will forbid your citizens coming into our territory, we will make you a Robinson Crusoe on a desert island'—there is no nation, however mighty, that could endure such an isolation. The business interests of the nation would compel the government to recede from its position and no longer remain an outlaw on the face of the earth." The mere threat of non-intercourse with any nation by an organized world would be quite adequate. It would never need to be carried into execution any more than our militia are ever called on to enforce decisions of our Supreme Court.

If even three friendly nations — the United States, Great Britain and France — should begin, and agree to continue to arbitrate every question with each other, as they have already

done for ninety years, and the two others to declare non-intercourse with any nation that refused arbitration and went to war with any one of the three, such an agreement published to the world would secure absolute immunity from attack for all three, and would practically result in the rest of the world joining with them, thus furthering a world organization which alone can bring international peace. This beginning, of course, would involve definite arrangements to reimburse merchants, if an embargo ever became a fact, and it would include an invitation to every other nation to enter this league for promoting peace without armaments. Preparations for war in 1908 are about as costly as actual war in 1898, but preparations for international non-intercourse as a substitute would cost nothing but the cost of international lawyers' fees and the drawing up of treaties. Bombardments affect only coast towns, but a withdrawal of business would affect as well even the hamlets farthest inland where anyone bought or sold. At the least cost, the most effectual compulsion towards peace is in the hands of the three Powers that are first willing to arbitrate everything with each other. Ultimately, even the threat of non-intercourse will be needless; but as the next step in providing a substitute for force that aims at bloodshed it seems necessary to have this resource theoretically available, though in all probability it would never be used a single week.

The degree of national defense needed is merely a question of existing danger and bears no necessary relation to population, length of coast line, dignity or wealth. China has a population ten times as great as that of France, but does not therefore need ten times as great a navy. Since the second Hague Conference the danger of bombardment of unfortified towns is ended, and therefore length of coast line is no measure of degree of danger. As one of our delegates to the Hague Conference has said: "If we want less danger we have but to tear down fortifications." A navy has no more to do with the dignity of a country than have fire-engines or life-saving stations. The degree of danger is largely a psychological question, requiring far more knowledge of human nature than of mechanics. The man whose thought has been for forty years focussed on the question of how to make and use the best instruments for killing enemies is the last man in the world to understand how to prevent making enemies. The health of the world depends not so much on bleeding and blisters and amputation as upon draining swamps and tearing down slums, upon sun and air, upon exercise and courage. The peace of the world depends not so much on steel destroyers as on the constructive, courageous statesmanship that forestalls enmity and turns it into bonded friendship.

Copies of this pamphlet may be obtained from the American Peace Society, 31 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., at two cents a copy.

What the Christian Church Needs to Know About War and Peace

7578.543

BY
LUCIA AMES MEAD

REPRINTED FROM THE
NOVEMBER-DECEMBER METHODIST REVIEW
1923

Lucia Ames Mead
July 29, 1935

WHAT THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH NEEDS TO KNOW ABOUT WAR AND PEACE

Lucia Ames Mead
Brookline, Mass.

John Ruskin somewhere said, "It is a state of mind very much to be dreaded for a man not to know the devil when he sees him." This state of mind is that of the credulous, well-meaning man who is hoodwinked by the current fallacies about war and peace. The devil of false premises and twisted logic comes appareled like an angel of light and a goddess of liberty. A graduate of Harvard University, of Annapolis, or West Point may know less of how to refute these fallacies than any fourteen-year-old schoolboy who is properly taught. Experts in mathematics, science and languages, history and theology may have little imagination, no knowledge of psychology, may becloud premises by prejudice, and even lack the milk of human kindness. It is therefore often necessary when dealing with such adults to be as simple and explicit on mooted questions as when talking to adolescents.

A graduate of the Harvard Medical School asserted, "War is inevitable, for man is a fighting animal. That is a biologic fact, due to his animal inheritance." The confused thinking which confounds struggle with collective homicide, which assumes that war, like earthquakes, cannot be prevented is one of the most common and dangerous of heresies. Until that fallacy is refuted, no real progress can be made in dealing with international relations. A false philosophy, like a foundation laid in quicksand, prevents any superstructure.

Struggle is the law of life. It is normal, inevitable, wholesome, and it invigorates. We have as little respect for a creature that will not struggle as for a clam or a sponge. Man was or-

dained to develop by constant struggle against nature and environment. He must everlastingly fight cold, hunger, disease, laziness, dirt, fire, accident, ignorance, sin, poverty, and death. We honor those like Shackleton, Nansen, David Livingstone, Raleigh, Columbus, and a thousand other heroes who have been great adventurers. The folly of confounding their type of struggle with collective homicide—the crushing out of human comrades, perhaps in Mexico, Japan, or Germany—is the most dangerous folly the world has ever known. These comrades should have been shoulder to shoulder with us together fighting the common foe in laboratory, field and forest. So long as this confounding of struggle that is normal with struggle that is abnormal is enshrined in romance and patriotism and religion, and confuses good minds, it will yield hectatombs of corpses.

Unlike sporadic murders, which require no premeditation and will indefinitely continue, modern war follows taxation, invention, training, war games, and long preparation. It has no counterpart in the animal world, for no herd or flock of brutes ever attack another *of their own species,* and individual tigers, lions, snakes, etc., do not kill their own kind, but only other kinds for food. "The biologic law" vanishes as soon as it is stated. But no skeptic is converted by a concise paragraph. The clergy need to devote one sermon a year to hammering home this argument, after a careful study of Dr. George Nasmyth's *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory.* Like the multiplication table, it must be drilled into every mind.

The cave man was not a creature with a club, ready to brain his neighbor. Like the chimpanzee, he lived on nuts and fruits, traveled only as far as he could walk, saw only his own neighbors and combined with them for self-preservation against the huge brutes—the prehistoric monsters. Without private property in land, without for probably fifty thousand years enough power of invention and organization even to equal our Indian warriors, he had nothing in common with Napoleon or Hindenburg. War did not make civilization. Struggle made civilization. Invention, greed, and a false philosophy made war, and are preparing more hideous and subtle devices to make more war. Civilization

thus far is as abnormal as a hunchback with long legs and a short, deformed body. Physics, chemistry, mechanics, and invention have done their best, but distorted vision and childish conceptions of what constitutes national advantage have set natural law to doing the devil's work. If our generation knew a hundredth part as much about the mechanism of wise government as every boy knows about Buicks and Fords, the world would not be in peril of another war and the safest nation in the world would not demand now for the first time to have as great a navy as any upon earth.

The militarists are proclaiming against law as a substitute for war. Admiral Rodgers declares that "War itself is an integral part of law. War is the agency whereby law is made to prevail when it is disputed by evildoers. The world must be governed under conditions as they exist, by nations with divergent interests which refuse to be reconciled. Armaments are therefore necessary to all, or one armed nation will ride the others." The editor of the *Army and Navy Register* writes of the "practical necessity of national protection that permits jeopardizing the safety of the country by any such avowed object as outlawing war and substituting law for war." The Secretary of War, in an address at West Point, is quoted as saying: "If it were not for the restraining effect of military establishments of the nations of the world, an indescribable state of chaos would result and civilization would be rapidly terminated through self-destruction." Says General J. G. Harbord: "War still remains the supreme act of the state, the school of heroism, and the training-ground for national discipline. Permanent, universal peace remains an ideal, lost in inaccessible distances, until envy, malice, lust, and avarice shall have disappeared from the human heart." An eminent clergyman recently said in Boston: "The instruments of war are the most effective builders of peace; the maintenance of militant forces on land and sea is necessary to safeguard civilization from the rule of the jungle."

These are the types of dangerously confused ideas which are being taught to our future officers and boys in summer camps at an age when they have done no independent thinking, but are

forming convictions and look with respect on the pronouncements of "practical men" who wear epaulettes. Loose thinking goes unchallenged. Police functions, that is, the taking of culprits to court with the least exercise of force that is necessary to obtain a judicial decision, are confounded with what goes on between rival nations trying to settle, through their armies, questions of boundary line, or markets, or "honor," by tanks and submarines! Legalized repression within the nation is confounded with what is done between nations in our present state of anarchy, which permits us to be judge, jury, and executioner in our own case. The placid assumption of each nation that the "evildoers" must always be the other nation, that we ourselves can do no wrong, and that "war is the agency by which law is made to prevail," ignores the wars of conquest, of revenge, of spoliation, dynastic and religious wars which have been in defiance of much law and all justice. Such doctrine is as false as anything the devil has concocted to lead good men astray. Even Theodore Roosevelt and Lyman Abbott constantly stumbled over the word "police," and spoke of armies and navies—the tools of rival nations—as "national police" and never asked what army or navy ever took a nation to court, or helped to a judicial decision. They never saw clearly the enormous distinction between police functions, conducted by non-rival bodies, and collective homicide between rival armies.

Granted that there may be collective, repressive force used by all nations against one aggressive nation by means of a small international police, or by universal boycott; but that is the maximum which a sane world will permit. This is not, properly speaking, "war." World court decrees at The Hague, like those of our Supreme Court at Washington, will require no force behind them but that of public opinion.

The fallacy most commonly held by religious minds is that war will not end until human brotherhood is achieved and the Golden Rule prevails. When men are all lovers of the Lord Jesus, then we shall cease concocting liquid fire to be thrown by wireless from aeroplanes, wiping out men, women, and children! Good people's skepticism of our being able to end war in this generation cuts the nerve of hope and action, and relegates permanent peace

to some far-off millennium. Dueling, wars between cities, as in ancient days, between provinces, and between states have been ended without any miracle or change of human nature. In this republic, though within each State we have excessive homicide and lawlessness, no State has ever fought against another State. Throughout the British Empire, black, white, and yellow people, speaking 150 languages, and having scores of different religions, are keeping the peace. What can be done over enormous areas of the world can be done by common agreement over the whole world. It is purely a matter of organization to make conditions in the world as safe as they are between the rich and poor sections of our cities. No love is lost between Riverside Drive and the east side. But the taxpayer sees that the east side has fire engines, schools, building-laws, parks, hospitals, courts, police, and a fairly safe condition of living. That is what the Christian Church should demand for the world—and demand it now. No congregation will absorb and digest this idea unless it is elaborated and reiterated with varied illustrations.

The economic causes of wars will still continue for a time, just as the causes of dueling still continue. These, however, can be chiefly removed as soon as such free trade as that between our States, which has been the basis of our prosperity, is extended to nations. There is no economic reason why Illinois should not have the same freedom of trade with Mexico that she has with Mississippi. A customs union over Europe would probably do more to remove friction and promote prosperity than anything else which could be devised, unless it be a collective control of the prime necessities of life—wheat, cotton, rubber, coal, and oil. It is needless to say that sound economics must be taught in all our schools for many years before this is achieved.

Peace and war are by-products. Peace is a product of successful organization. War is a by-product of an unorganized world, of confused thinking, of war preparations. The primary consideration is world justice and world organization to attain it. The most significant thing in the last hundred years has not been the World War, but the new intercommunication wrought by railroad, telegraph, automobile, telephone, aeroplane, radio, cheap

press and postage, and photography. These will abide indefinitely and be marvelously amplified after the devastation, misery, and poverty wrought by war have disappeared. Said Professor Nicolai, author of the *Biology of War,* probably the profoundest book ever written since Grotius on war, "The war is only an episode and intercommunication is an epoch."

Glenn Frank, in the Century, has pointed out that editors underestimate their readers' intelligence and overestimate their amount of information. The same might be said of clergymen. What the average churchgoer needs is specific information on vital matters which affect conduct and about which he has much misinformation. The war psychology is still rampant. "I have no patience whatever with the Hun. He is squealing and whining and refusing to pay his just debts," is a common verdict with the ill-informed and many a clergyman himself says, "The invasion of the Ruhr may not be ideal, but it is an inevitable attempt to rectify colossal evil." It requires energy and courage for the average clergyman to find and tell the truth about the matter without being scorned as being "pro-German." The judicial attitude that tries "to be just, even to those to whom we do not want to be just," is not common even among the followers of Jesus. All the more reason for the pastor to tell unwelcome truths. Let him cite Hosea and Amos, whose Hebrew politics have become part of our religion, if the deacons accuse him of "talking politics." Party politics of course must be absolutely avoided, but questions involving international duty should not be side-tracked as unfitted for the pulpit, or at least for discussion at midweek meetings. Bishop Brent utters a message from the Most High when he proclaims that international questions are just as much our concern as national questions. We are first of all human beings, citizens of the world, children of God.

To indulge in mere pious generalities about righteousness and justice, and to leave the listener uninformed as to facts which one needs to know in order to achieve righteousness and justice, is a common but cowardly pastoral method of giving no offense and sliding out of moral responsibility. This is in keeping with the policy of the church in every land which rendered it helpless to

prevent war. Take this tragic question of reparations, which has prevented the rehabilitation of Europe for five years. Churchgoers, like other people, have short memories. They should be reminded that when Germany pledged herself to pay, she signed a blank check at the point of the bayonet at Versailles in 1919 to avoid an invasion of Germany. She had surrendered on the ground of the fourteen points, which were largely ignored in the vindictive Versailles treaty. Not until long after a post-war boycott had starved her people when they were helpless was she told what the reparations commission had dictated. This, according to Pierrepont Noyes,[1] equaled 74 per cent of her total valuation. The absurdity of this was soon apparent and the amount was cut down to 43 per cent, or about thirty-three billion dollars, gold. Americans are demanding that Germany shall "stop shirking and promptly pay as France did in 1871." They need to be informed, as the Institute of Economics has just shown in its nearly 400-page report,[2] "Germany's Capacity to Pay," that though France adjusted her debt quickly by various forms of loans and transferences, it was not the supposed thrift of the French people which wiped out the indemnity. It is still a burden on French finances and the interest on it at three per cent is now 165,000,000 francs a year. The whole debt was only about four per cent of France's total valuation.

The chief thing for the world to understand is the philosophy of reparations. Much bitterness, unjust criticism, and dangerous delay in the rehabilitation of Europe and our taking our proper share of responsibility would be prevented were there clear ideas on this subject. At the time of writing, in early September, 1923, probably one half of the American people sustain Poincaré in saying, "Germany must pay, or we stay." Our ignorance and neutrality prolong the impasse between Great Britain and France.

The report of the Institute of Economics says that "Germany cannot feed more than 60 per cent of her people unless she can continue and pay for her present imports of foodstuffs; about one sixth of her agricultural lands were taken from her at the close of

[1] Formerly American member of the Inter-Allied Commission of the Rhineland and President of the Interallied Coal Commission.

[2] McGraw-Hill Book Co., 370 Seventh Ave., New York.

the war. Food and raw materials must be a first charge on foreign money obtained for the sales of exports; only the money left over after these are paid can be devoted to reparations. The Allies cannot eat their cake and have it too. They cannot collect anything from Germany so long as they refuse to let Germany earn by foreign trade money acceptable to them. . . . The total production of gold in the world since the discovery of America is little more than half the sum which Germany is obligated to pay." Germany's present supply of gold would pay reparations for only six months.

Foreign debts cannot be paid on the same basis as domestic debts. Germany has been harshly criticised for building canals, factories, etc., as if this diverted money from reparations. But she used home materials, paid *in paper money* and none of this product could be exported. *Exports alone can pay for reparations. And they must exceed imports.* These exports must chiefly be created from imported raw materials.

Germany offered to supply material and labor for rebuilding the devastated districts, but the builders and workmen of France wanted the jobs and their protest led to the decline of this offer. It is often assumed that Germany has paid nothing. The Institute of Economics reports that she has surrendered between six and seven billion dollars worth of property. The Allies by no means credit her with all this for reparations. Germany made contracts, payable in gold, payable in other legal tender after August, 1914. This, apparently, is why she was able to wipe out her internal debt with a rapidly depreciating currency—a virtual colossal taxation of her citizens. It was necessary for her to begin inflation in order to pay the early installments of reparations. She has not known how to stop, as her purchases of foreign currency could continue only as long as foreigners had confidence in her mark. Germany has lost all credit, and without a moratorium faces a collapse. The final conclusion of the exhaustive investigations of the Institute of Economics is that "It is utterly impossible for any one to know whether, in view of all the conditions that exist and will continue to exist, Germany will be able to develop any export surplus. It depends on wholly indeterminate factors.

The Germans themselves do not know a particle more about the possibility than anyone else. Hence the promise to pay any definite sum per year that may under military compulsion be extracted from the German government would be not a whit more than the 'agreement' reached in London in May, 1921. No threat or compulsion, no promise, no guarantee of any kind whatsoever will insure payment of any definite sum. If the Allies hope to get paid, there is only one policy to follow, namely, to facilitate the recovery of German import and export trade, and then to require the delivery of whatever excess of exports may be developed. . . . The process of compelling Germany to pay, when she has no international credit balance available for the purpose, is analogous to forcing complete liquidation upon a temporarily insolvent debtor. A little more juice may be squeezed out by the process and then the end."

Closely connected with the psychology of the American people and the concrete financial problems facing Europe is the new information which is slowly percolating through the press regarding the "sole responsibility" of Germany for creating the war. The Kautsky, Gooss and Siebert documents which have been brought to light, the studies of Professor Fay of Smith College, and especially of E. D. Morel, M.P., show conclusively that Russia, as well as Austria and Germany, was immediately responsible for the war and that, more remotely, Great Britain and France created conditions which promoted unrest and war. We are gradually learning the truth uttered by Lloyd George in December, 1920, "The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before August 1, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war. It was something into which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled." Doubtless a little group of Germans, including professors and editors as well as military men, were largely responsible; but one must study carefully the available documents before wholesale condemnation of Germany as the "sole" sinner. Justice regarding this matter does not exculpate her from atrocities committed or lessen her obligation to repay wanton destruction to the limit possible.

A little time taken from the study of concordances and church fathers to learn the facts needed for their congregations in order to do justice and love mercy would serve the pastors who are practically working as well as praying for Christ's kingdom to come on earth. If every community could once a fortnight turn its midweek meeting into a study of history and economics and if this were led by Christian preachers who would take time for research[3] there would be less bitterness and confusion of thought in the pews.

"Organize the world" should be the slogan of civilization. Said one of the winners of the Nobel Peace Prize: "Peace, according to pacifism, means a condition of organized living together among nations." Pacifism simply means peace-making and a pacifist is a peacemaker, not peace talker, or dreamer. Jesus said such were blessed. The word "pacifist" has been caricatured, derided, and so misunderstood that many conceive it to apply only to the flabby and cowardly who would not risk their skin to defend their country. There are as many types of pacifists as there are of Christians. The latter include persons of faiths varying from that of Unitarians to that of Roman Catholics. A very few pacifists are unstatesmanlike extremists who injure their own cause by demanding our absolute disarmament at once and ask Congress for an amendment to the Constitution to remove every word that authorizes armaments. The great majority of peacemakers are not extremists; they know that all progress is made by steps and are busy advocating the logical, progressive steps toward outlawry of war and the extension to nations of that system of courts and police force which has achieved order and justice between individuals, between cities, between our forty-eight States, between all parts of empires and nations, and which, in the League of Nations, is beginning to be applied to the whole world.

---

[3] See article on "They All Lied" in the Nation, Oct. 11, 1922; "New Light on the Orgins of the War, *American Historical Review*, 1920–1921; "The Poison That Destroys," price 2d; "Military Preparations for the Great War," price 6d, the first, published by The Independent Labor Party, 8, Johnson Court, Fleet St., London, the second by The Labour Publishing Co., 38 Great Ormond St., London; and "The Secret History of a Great Betrayal," published by Foreign Affairs, Orchard House, Great Smith St., London, S. W., price 1s. All of these three are by E. D. Morel, M.P., who won Winston Churchill's seat, an expert investigator, and giving chapter and verse for all his statements.

After the 7,000,000 majority for President Harding, the quadrennial of the Federal Council of Churches, in December, 1920, declared: "The supreme hope for the future is in the League of Nations. This is the one worth-while, definite thing that has come out of the war. The call for our nation to enter this League and help make it a really effective instrument for righting wrongs and adjusting national difficulties is the greatest moral call that has ever come to the church in all its history. The peace of the world and the hope of humanity rest on the proper strengthening of the League." The Federal Council of Churches stands by that pronouncement and none of its twenty-nine constituent denominations have dissented.

America is beginning to realize that the huge number of votes in 1920, claimed as a condemnation of the League, were largely cast by voters of both parties who were assured by leaders like Taft, Hoover, Hughes, Root, Lowell, and others in the group of thirty-one eminent Republicans, that a vote for Harding was the surest way to secure our entrance into the League or into an Association of Nations. The 1922 election and the Minnesota election have led to questioning whether the Republicans will have any sure majority in 1924. It seems that our entrance into the League will be a strong factor in the situation. The tide is turning and the partisan fury and abysmal ignorance of the League Covenant which then prevailed is diminished. It is doubtful whether one voter in a hundred had then read the League Covenant.

A new situation confronts us to-day. If we enter the League we shall not sign the largely impracticable and vindictive Versailles treaty. We should enter as Switzerland or any other neutral nation entered. We should not have to condone now Japan's occupation of Shantung, as she has evacuated it. We should take our proper place in the family of nations with the right to withdraw honorably by giving two years' notice and paying our dues. We can enter with full reservations as to our never pledging ourselves to military action abroad without the consent of Congress and to nothing which contravenes our Constitution.

Our refusal to enter has prevented the League from acting

to end the dangerous traffic in arms that has provided many nations with the accumulated arms left over from the war and which have aided various hostile ventures. Our aloofness has produced a painful impression. We are to-day, through unofficial representations, altering that bad policy. Had we succeeded in securing the two-thirds vote of the Senate, which Senator Newberry, on his resignation, boasted his one vote had prevented, we should have entered the League with the approval of the majority of our voters; and the wars between Poland and Russia and Greece and Turkey and the invasion of the Ruhr would probably have been prevented. It is a sad anomaly that permits us to enter on war with a majority vote but prohibits our making a peace treaty without a two-thirds vote. As ex-Ambassador John W. Davis declares, this long hindrance to justice should be abolished by an amendment to the Constitution. The recent revelation by Mr. Wellman of President Harding's conviction that we could not "countenance persistent isolation and indifference as our national policy," and that he intended next year to invite "all the nations of the world to a Congress," and the statement of Prof. Irving Fisher show how far President Harding was from standing with the Johnson-Moses-Brandegee "irreconcilables." In 1920 President Harding told Professor Fisher: "I want the United States to get into the League just as much as you do. I am opposed to the Wilson League, but the League can be changed. My idea is to call the nations together and ask them to make such amendments as are necessary to secure the approval of the United States." In reference to a noted Senator who was opposed, he said: "When he takes his extreme stand he is doing so for political effect. With my own forces divided on details, my first concern is to get these forces together."

At its headquarters in the federated republic of Switzerland, the most internationally minded country of Europe, the League has created an atmosphere that is unique among the suspicious, greedy, discouraged peoples of Europe. Its hundreds of experts on geography, ethnology, history, economics, and law are creating speedy and valuable communication between the nations. What no one nation could do to lift Austria from complete collapse, to

stop the spread of terrible epidemics, to remove conditions which were in four instances leading to war, the League has done. No one nation could have repatriated the 400,000 wretched, starving war-prisoners in Russia, but the League did it. It is grappling with the problem of opium production; with the traffic in women and children; with the supervision of the mandated territory, which, but for the League, would have been simply stolen and annexed. The establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice, whose eleven judges, including an American, have been functioning for a year and more, is another great achievement in which we should at once participate.

The Borah-Levinson plea for the outlawry of war, on the purpose of which all right-minded people must agree, is strangely coupled with hostility to the World Court. This can gradually be made as powerful as can any court which Mr. Borah wants set up, as soon as the nations of the earth are ready to make the necessary sacrifices. The illogicality of the Borah position, the failure to see what is necessarily involved in getting a treaty for the outlawry of war, is most astutely presented by Walter Lippman in the August Atlantic. "Once more," he says, "we see the tragic futility of noble sentiments frustrated by confused ideas."

No League can outlaw war, so long as a great, armed nation like our own remains outside it and claims the right by international law to go to war to-morrow if it pleases. Critics condemn the League because its Covenant does not go further in certain directions. It is imperfect, as present world conditions necessitate; as imperfect as was our Constitution when Alexander Hamilton, who was greatly dissatisfied with it, loyally appealed for its support, knowing that the alternative was disintegration and no federated republic. He and his coworkers failed to secure more than nine States out of the thirteen for ratification. The necessity of the first Congress to add ten amendments at once, the two years' delay before anyone trusted our Supreme Court with a contested case, are all reminders of the weakness of the beginnings of great undertakings and of their possibilities of growth. George Washington was called to organize a nation. That nation is now summoned to help organize the world.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

NOV 14 1935